DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 179 IR 004 969

AUTHOR Valleau, Emily Hearn; Baril, Michele
TITLE A Report on the Children's Program Workshop.
INSTITUTION Children's Broadcast Inst., Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 71p.; Workshop held Ottawa, Canada, October 14-16, 1975 ; Some parts in French

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Childrens Television; *Conference Reports; *Fantasy; *Programing (Broadcast); Television Viewing; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This collection of speech summaries, workshop findings, and panel and discussion texts given by a total of 23 producers, programmers, performers, researchers, and writers, focuses on Canadian children's television. Introductory remarks by Nan-B. de Gaspe Beaubien are included with summaries of presentations by Sam Rabinovitch, James Dormeyer, Bob Keeshan, and Rod Coneybeare. Texts of panel and question and answer discussions on "reality or fantasy" and "what makes a good program good" are provided as well as outlines of nine workshops. Agenda outline, lists of committee and participating members, lists of children's television shows viewed, and a summary of responses to a workshop questionnaire are appended. Sections are written in English, French, or both. (KP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED142179

A Report on
The Children's Program Workshop

Rapport sur
Le Colloque Atelier sur la programmation pour enfants

Hotel Talisman
Ottawa, October 14-15, 1975.

Chairperson
Présidente

Nan B. de Gaspé Beaubien

Report edited and prepared by:
Annoté et préparé par:

Emily Hearn Valleau
Michèle Baril

IR004969

INDEX
TABLE DES MATIERES

Foreword / Avant-propos 1

Speakers, Panelists and Workshops Leaders / Conferenciers, panelistes et présidents d'ateliers 2

Introductory Remarks / Préliminaires 7

Guest Speaker / Conférencier invite 8

Speakers / Conférenciers 9

Panel: Theme: "Reality or Fantasy?" / "Réalité ou fantaisie?" 12

Questions / Discussion 15

Panel: Theme: "What Makes a Good Program Good?" / Qu'est-ce qu'une bonne émission?" 22

Questions / Discussions 28

Workshop: "Building from Nothing"/
Atelier: "A partir de rien" 35

Workshop: "Reality or Fantasy?"/
Atelier: "Réalité ou fantaisie?" 36

Workshop: "What Makes a Good Program Good?"/
Atelier: "Qu'est-ce qu'une bonne émission?" 37

Workshop: "Who is Watching and Why?"/
Atelier: "Qui régarde quoi et pourquoi?" 38

Workshop: "Working with Children"/
Atelier: "Travailler avec les enfants" 39

Summing Up / Discours de clôture 40

Research Meetings / Réunions des recherchistes 42

Report and Comments / Rapport et commentaires (André Caron) 46

Comments / Commentaires (Maurice Gill) 48

Appendix / Annexe 49

FOREWORD

The Children's Broadcast Institute, a national grouping of concerned organizations and individuals formed to improve the quality and quantity of programming for Canadian children, hosted a Workshop for producers, programmers, performers, researchers and writers in the field of Canadian Children's television in Ottawa October 14-16, 1975.

One hundred and thirty participants viewed Canadian TV shows for children, heard speakers and panelists and were active in small workshop discussions and demonstrations. These related to the Workshop themes: *Reality* or *Fantasy?* and *What Makes a Good Program Good?*

The audience itself, a mix of English-and French-speaking Canadians representing broadcast business and government sectors and drawn from small as well as large communities across Canada, took full advantage of the rare chance to meet people with similar concerns facing similar problems in the children's television field.

This report provides a summary of the main speeches, an outline of workshop findings and a transcribed text of panels and audience discussion.

Outlines of the three days program and background notes on speakers are attached, as well as a summary of responses to a questionnaire distributed to all participants.

AVANT-PROPOS

L'Institut de Radio-Télédiffusion pour Enfants formé afin d'améliorer la qualité et d'accroître la quantité des émissions canadiennes destinées aux enfants, tenait, à Ottawa, du 14 au 16 octobre 1975, un Colloque-atelier, réunissant les producteurs, réalisateurs, acteurs, chercheurs et écrivains du domaine de la télévision canadienne destinée aux enfants.

Cent-trente participants y ont visionné des émissions canadiennes destinées aux enfants, ont entendu des conférenciers et panelistes et ont pris part aux discussions et aux démonstrations des ateliers, dont les thèmes étaient: *Réalité ou Fantaisie?* et *Qu'est-ce qu'une bonne émission?*

L'auditoire, composée de représentants de l'industrie de la radiodiffusion et de divers organismes gouvernementaux, venus de toutes les régions du Canada, ont vraiment profité de l'occasion de rencontrer d'autres gens partageant les mêmes préoccupations.

Ce rapport comprend un résumé des principaux discours, un aperçu des recherches en atelier ainsi qu'une transcription des discussions des panelistes et de l'auditoire.

On trouvera à l'Annexe 4, le programme de ces trois jours, quelques notes biographiques sur les conférenciers ainsi qu'un résumé des réponses à un questionnaire distribué à tous les participants.

SPEAKERS, PANELISTS AND WORKSHOP LEADERS
CONFERENCIERS, PANELISTES ET PRESIDENTS D'ATELIERS

David Adams

Mr. Adams has been with B.B.M. for the past 9 years and is presently Manager of Member Relations. His broadcasting experience includes 5 years in Nigeria and before that with an educational shortwave station in Boston. Mr. Adams was Media Researcher with MacLaren Advertising before his move to B.B.M.

Harry J. Boyle

Has had experience in many fields during a distinguished and varied career. He has been journalist and columnist for such papers as London Free Press, Globe & Mail and Toronto Telegram. Has worked in radio and television, first in the private sector and from 1942 for many years, in positions such as Supervisor of Farm Broadcasts, Program Director, Executive Producer with the CBC. Author of novels and essays, winner in 1963 of Stephen Leacock Medal. Writer of plays for radio and stage. Mr. Boyle was presented the John Drainie Award from ACTRA in 1970. He became Vice-Chairman of CRTC in 1968 and is presently the Acting Chairman.

Michel Cailloux

Né en France, arrivé au Canada en 1955 et magicien depuis toujours. Auteur et principal acteur de l'émission "Bobino" et auteur et scripteur des textes de "Franfeluche", "Marie Quat'-poches", "La Souris Verte", "Picolo". Ecrit présentement "Nic et Pic", la première série d'émissions pour enfants à être traduite en anglais.

André Caron

Membre du corps professoral, département des Communications de l'Université de Montréal. Auteur de diverses communications lors des congrès suivants: L'Association Canadienne des Annonceurs, Corporate Communicators of Quebec, Association for Consumer Research, l'Association Canadienne Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences. A écrit un article intitulé "Les Effets de la Publicité sur les Enfants" et collaboré à la rédaction de "Le Québécois de la Télévision". Finalement, est co-auteur avec Scott Ward, de "Operation Santa Claus: A Pilot Study of Decision Making by Children and Parents", à paraître prochainement.

Rod Coneybeare

Ever since its inception, Rod has been Jerome on the Friendly Giant. He also wrote the very popular radio program for 8-10 year olds in the late 50's, the Rod and Charles Show. He was Executive Producer for Bananas which had a short but dramatic life. He has written extensively for both radio and television and is currently beginning a new series for CBLT, In Good Company.

Nan-B de Gaspé Beaublen

Well-known child psychologist and lecturer, past-president of the Canadian Council on Children and Youth, Director and Secretary of the Institute, and Chairman of the Workshop.

Rita Deverell

Rita Shelton Deverell, B.A. Adelphi University, M.A. Columbia University (Union Theological). Teacher of Creative Arts to emotionally disturbed children from 1967-1970. Actress and performer. From 1973 has been the Co-ordinator of The Children's Television Project, Religious Television Associates. Currently Editor of TUBE.

James Dormeyer

Après trois ans d'études à l'Institut des Hautes Etudes cinématographiques de Paris, entra au service de Radio-Canada en 1968. Réalisateur des émissions "Jeunesse Oblige", "Grujot et Délicat", de cinq émissions "Dossier" sur le comportement des enfants en pré-maternelle et de trois autres sur le mariage. Depuis quatre saisons, concepteur et réalisateur d'émissions en direct, notamment "Teléchrome" et "Connexion".

Janis Dunning

Actress, dancer, singer, choreographer, hostess of CKY's Let's Go, numerous appearances with CBC and CKY. Choreographed The Magic Trumpet and various ballets. Performed in musicals in Winnipeg's Rainbow Stage and MTC and in London, England.

Maurice Falardeau

Etudes spécialisées aux Compagnons de Saint-Laurent, puis de mise en scène au Théâtre du Nouveau Monde. Entre au service de Radio-Canada en 1954 comme assistant à la production et en 1958 devient réalisateur au Service des Emissions Jeunesse TV. Réalisa notamment: "Bobino", "Beau Temps, Mauvais Temps" (téléroman pour adolescents), "Dans tous les Cantons" (émission musicale), "Ti-Jean Caribou" (série d'aventure), "Au Jardin de Pierrot", "Franfeluche", "Sol et Gobelet", "Picotine", "Avec le Temps" et "Le Grenier", une nouvelle série qu'il réalise cette année.

Patrick Gossage

Associate Director, Research Branch, CRTC. Former television producer with Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and CTV. Director of the Institute.

Bill Hartley

Television producer of the new CTV children's program Kidstuff. Producer of Monkey Bars and several other children's programs for the Ontario Educational Communications Authority.

Bob Keeshan

For the past twenty years, he has been the star of the show he developed Captain Kangaroo. Before that he was Clarabelle, the Clown on the Howdy Doody Show. Bob Keeshan knows a great deal about the pluses and problems involved in producing quality children's programs.

John Kennedy

Now head of the Children's Television Department, CBC, English Service Division. John was for many years a producer of children's programs. For the past seven years was on the faculty of Yale University, teaching film, videotape and television production.

Margery King

Graduate from Western in Honours Philosophy and Psychology; Ph.D. from University of Toronto in Psychology. Dr. King's career has included research and organizational positions with the Veterans' Advisory Bureau, University of Toronto; Toronto Psychiatric Hospital; Canadian Mental Health Association and she is presently Executive Director of the CCCY, and a Director of CBI. From 1965-1970 she was senior staff member on the CELDIC Commission.

Jean-Paul Ladouceur

Administrateur, producteur, cinéaste, peintre et auteur. A été graphiste animateur à l'ONF; directeur de la section enfantine et de la production de réseau à Radio Canada; directeur artistique à France Film; directeur des programmes et de la production commerciale à Télé-Métropole. Actuellement Président de JPL Productions et conseiller auprès du réseau TVA. Peintre et auteur de "La Couleur à la Télévision" et d'un album pour enfants.

Michele Landsberg

Child actor on stage and television. Graduate in English Language and Literature from the University of Toronto. Reporter and feature writer for the Globe & Mail, CBC free[illegible]ncer,

writer for the Star Weekly and Reader's Digest. Now Associate Editor of Chatelaine, special column devoted to children, Your Kids and Mine.

Robert Liebert — Ph.D. in child clinical psychology from Stanford University. Presently Professor of Psychology and Psychiatry, State University of New York at Stony Brook. Author of 80 published articles and seven books. Long interested in the effects of television and film on children, he was principal researcher for the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Television. Author of The Early Window: Effects of Television on Children and Youth.

Sam Rabinovitch — Educated at McGill University, Ph.D. from Purdue University in Psychology. Many years as research psychologist and for ten years Director of the Department of Psychology, Montreal Children's Hospital. Currently, Director of the Learning Centre, Montreal Children's Hospital. Well-known authority on effects of television on children. Advisor to the CBC on the inserts for Sesame Street. Author of more than twenty articles on psychology.

Robert Roy — Etudes en histoire et en sociologie à l'Université de Montréal et à la Sorbonne. Après un court séjour à la radio dans l'entreprise privée, entre à Radio-Canada comme scripteur. Depuis 1966, occupe les postes d'adjoint à la direction des programmes TV et ensuite adjoint au vice-président et directeur général. En 1970, il devient chef-adjoint au Service des Emissions Jeunesse et prend la direction de ce service en 1972.

Madeleine Saint-Jacques — B.A., Université de Montréal, vice-présidente et directrice de la création française chez Young & Rubicam Ltd., Montréal. Spécialisée en programmation française (radio-TV). Ex-présidente de Publicité-Club de Montréal; Directrice de l'Association Canadienne pour la Santé mentale; du Bureau Consultatif de la Publicité au Canada. Première vice-présidente de l'IRTE.

Chris Sarson — Graduated with Honours in law and music from Cambridge University. He has produced and directed television programs in Great Britain and the United States, specializing in drama.

music, and children's programs. His latest success was ZOOM, a series by and for children 6 to 12. He is currently developing a series about the arts for children.

Arthur Weinthal

Vice-President of Entertainment Programming CTV, Executive Producer of CTV's new children's program Kidstuff, Director and Chairman of the Workshop Panel discussions and Director of the Institute.

October 14, 1975.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS
Nan-B. de Gaspé Beaubien
Workshop Chairperson

Mme de Gaspé Beaubien pointed out that children are too often considered second-class citizens by adults and that this attitude is reflected in the media. As our most vital asset and as TV's most faithful audience, averaging 23 hours a week viewing, they deserve healthier respect than they receive.

She recalled seeing as a young girl a motto in the office of Harry Truman, THE BUCK STOPS HERE. He explained to her that's what it meant to be President — no one to pass the buck to.

That, she suggested, should be the self-assumed role of CBI — a body representing all those sectors in broadcasting, government and business who must take ultimate responsibility for more and better broadcasting to Canadian children.

She said that changes should come from within the industry, and that the CBI should be a catalyst to ensure that parents and the general public are better informed about children's television, and that the broadcasters continue to be more responsive to the needs of the child audience.

Le 14 octobre 1975

PRELIMINAIRES
Nan-B. de Gaspé Beaubien
Présidente du Colloque

Mme de Gaspé Beaubien a signalé qu'en général, les adultes considèrent les enfants comme des citoyens de deuxième classe et que les media d'information, qui se veulent le reflet de la société, ont souvent démontré la même tendance. Les enfants, points d'ancrage de notre société et nos plus fervents auditeurs, avec une moyenne de 23 heures d'écoute par semaine, méritent un plus grand respect que celui qu'on leur accorde.

Elle a évoqué une visite au bureau d'Harry Truman, où elle avait vu cette devise: "THE BUCK STOPS HERE" et où il expliquait à la fillette qu'elle était ce que signifiait être président: personne sur qui se dégager de ses responsabilités.

Ceci, suggère-t-elle, devrait être le rôle de l'I.R.T.E.: un organisme représentant les divers éléments qui composent notre pays, dans le domaine des affaires, des communications, du gouvernement et qui doit prendre la responsabilité d'améliorer et d'accroître la programmation destinée aux enfants canadiens.

Elle a indiqué que les changements devraient provenir de l'industrie et que l'I.R.T.E. devrait faire en sorte que les parents et le public soient mieux informés sur la télévision et l'enfant. L'I.R.T.E. devrait s'assurer, de plus, que les radiodiffuseurs continuent de répondre aux besoins des enfants téléspectateurs.

October 14, 1975

GUEST SPEAKER
Harry Boyle
Acting Chairman CRTC

As Acting Chairman of the CRTC Harry Boyle voiced the Commission's determination that "broadcasters recognize their special responsibilities to the young viewer, not just by insisting on higher commercial standards, but by striving for higher standards both in children's programming and in programming children watch". He promised its support in protecting Canada's efforts at quality programming from "dilution by an influx of broadcasts many of which are produced without the constraint of care".

He was critical of current broadcasting on two counts: display of violence and misrepresentation of city life.

Excessive violence on TV writes scenarios for terrorists and can be seen as condonation of vandalism by unmotivated youngsters.

More devastating, he feels, is "to place in the child's mind the concept that cities are primitive, deadly places filled with warring tribes of people," at the same time sentimentalizing folksy virtues of rural life.

Our society is urban-dominated. Most children are city-dwellers, living in the midst of positive cultural resource and stimulus. TV should present them with the "marvel, magic, wonder and excitement" of their environment.

October 15, 1975 – Theme, "Reality or Fantasy"

SPEAKER
Dr. Sam Rabinovitch
Director of Learning Centre:
Montreal Children's Hospital

Children receive TV messages differently than adults. Dr. Rabinovitch said it would help in the production of TV shows for children if it were well understood that physical action speaks more clearly to them than words.

Until a child is two there is no separation of the visual image of an object from the way it moves. Intellectual development of a young child is really motor or muscle intelligence.

Until a child is six he uses action as the major way of coping with things. Then perception and symbols come to represent motor activity. After he is seven words begin to take on more profound meaning.

Because television supplies this motor stimulation it is the greatest teacher ever. Dr. Rabinovitch is concerned about *what* it teaches. It is superb if it is used to instill good values that will effect long-term behaviour, if it feeds a child's hunger for discovery, if it encourages him to value and trust his own abilities.

Fine programming skilfully combines instruction and entertainment. Dr. Rabinovitch warns that action groups, dissatisfied with mediocre television are forming to convince politicians of the need to "certify" entertainers, and programmers just as other professionals – doctors, teachers, electricians – are answerable to society's interest.

Le 15 octobre 1975

CONFERENCIER
James Dormeyer
Réalisateur aux Emissions Jeunesse
Société Radio-Canada
"En direct". L'Expérience "Téléchrome"*

(Résumé)
But de l'émission: création d'un monde d'aventure à l'intérieur du système; l'établissement d'une communication entre les enfants et les "techniciens" (radiodiffuseurs, réalisateurs, peintres et dessinateurs, équipe technique, etc...); un lien entre les ondes et les hommes.

Cette expérience a permis d'utiliser la nature même de l'image électronique: son instantanéité. Les émissions en direct permettent l'improvisation, la démystification du medium (et des métiers qui y sont rattachés), elles redonnent toute sa crédibilité à l'image.

La participation se fait par téléphone et implique autant les techniciens en studio (et, partant, leur créativité) que les téléspectateurs. La véritable communication s'établit au moment de l'observation des résultats de la participation (dessins exécutés, en studio, par des artistes, sur les conseils et inspirations des jeunes téléspectateurs.)

Aspect didactique: possibilité pour les enfants de s'exprimer verbalement, d'extérioriser leurs sentiments, de se définir par le dessin. Promotion de la bande dessinée; occasion d'en assimiler la syntaxe et la grammaire.*

*des extraits plus détaillés (en français) de l'exposé de James Dormeyer, se trouvent en annexe VIII.

SUMMARY

The Radio-Canada program *Télēchrome* was shown to the whole group and impressed everyone with the effort its producer was willing to make to give children a show place for their own creative expression. Children on camera draw stories other children phone in. The power of children's original work was revealed in its integrity, no gimmicks. It contributed to an impression many people took away with them — French programming in Canada is generally of higher calibre than the English.

October 15, 1975.

SPEAKER

Bob Keeshan
Captain Kangaroo

Bob Keeshan's show for children, CAPTAIN KANGAROO, has been running for twenty years on CBS. He acknowledged the special responsibility that entertainers carry when they are broadcasting to very young people. When they assume this they have a right to hope that parents are also showing concern.

"We put emphasis on the quality of TV and not enough emphasis on the quantity of TV — the time a child spends watching the set." He pointed out that studies have shown that a kindergarten child has already seen 5,000 hours of TV.

"Preschool age is an age of exploration. It's a sin if those of us in the industry turn it into an age of exploitation. We talk about protecting minority groups, yet children are a minority representing twenty percent of the community. But it's not a vocal minority. Exploiting a child seems to be constitutionally protected."

He urged Canadians to produce their own shows even though they face a barrage of competition from American stations.

October 16, 1975

SPEAKER

Rod Coneybeare
Freelance writer, producer
Performer
Friendly Giant

Rod Coneybeare said that TV programming is making cynics of young children.

"TV has taught my children that TV is manure. They know all the clichés and my eleven year-old is ready now to start writing scripts. They don't believe anything on TV except the news. They know the commercials lie, and if they know that already who knows what the next generation will think."

He attacked CBC top management in the past for "cursory attention to children's programming and the most miniscule budgets". On the other hand he recognized the CBC as "the only source in this country of children's programming that does not exist for the purpose of selling someone's toys, cereals or whatever, and we have never taken full advantage of that".

His brilliant and highly popular radio show, ROD AND CHARLES, was not transferred to TV and his short-run children's TV show, BANANAS, wasn't continued although it had plenty to say to children in a zany format.

He appreciates his role as giraffe and chicken on the FRIENDLY GIANT. The

puppets are children passing the time of day in leisurely fashion with a GIANT parent. "My mother", he said, "wanted me to become a brilliant doctor, but I turned out to be a giraffe. I wanted to write like Arthur Miller, but I wound up making much more money being a chicken."

October 15, 1975.

PANEL: THEME "REALITY OR FANTASY?"
Chairman: Arthur Weinthal
Dr. Sam Rabinovitch
Robert Liebert
Michel Cailloux
Bill Hartley

Sam Rabinovitch
I think the idea was to react in some way — to the notion of reality and fantasy and for that reaction to be tempered by what we have seen this morning. I understand that Aristotle and Plato and those boys had trouble figuring out reality and fantasy so you're not going to get any comments on that topic from me. The only thing that comes through to me when I try to think of this question is the word "possibility".

The child as I understand him can use television to explore possibilities. I'm translating fantasy, imagination, all those things, into the term "possibility". When he's little he can explore through television the possibility of movement, the possibilities of visual perception, the possibilities of auditory perception. As he gets a little older he can cope with the possibilities of linguistics, of language, the possibilities of ideas, the possibilities of problem-solving.

To me, the greatest thing that I can hope for from television for kids is that it would really open up all kinds of possibilities in many, many spheres — all the way from very personal kinds of things — to very interpersonal kinds of things.

One of the things we watched came to me because Durrell sat there and said that everybody told him he would fail, that htis dream he had was silly, and he did it! It was possible. And if I were a kid I think I might get excited by that. But you shouldn't go out in life listening to those people who tell you you can't do it, you won't do it, because there's a terrific thing that happens...it must be terrific because the newspapers show headlines, if it shows headlines it means you're in...it means he did it. It's possible to do, for god's sake, even though there are always people around to tell you, don't do it, don't do this, don't do that.

Robert Liebert
I think in 3 minutes all I can hope to do is give you a broad view of how I think about children and television. And I suppose my major theme is this, that all television can teach children. That all television regardless of what its content is is going to have one or more messages for the young child.

So our job is trying to find a way of understanding what that message will be and how children will react to it. To simplify the task a little bit I find it convenient to think about three questions for any TV program.

First of all, will children select it, will they watch it, will they attend to it. That's of great interest to the researcher and obviously of great interest to the creative person, to the producer and to the broadcaster.

The second question is, given that children watch a bit of television, what will they understand in it? what will they learn from it, how will they comprehend it. And we have found very frequently that the intended message, what we as adults would comprehend in a bit of programming is often very different and sometimes quite the opposite of what a young child will comprehend.

Third, and perhaps in many ways the most important question, what influence will a bit of programming have on a child's behaviour? In our own work we try to use systematic research to test each of these questions and then to put together the larger picture of the impact of a bit of programming, if we are involved in the production with an eye to altering aspects of the programming so as to increase appeal, so as to improve comprehension, so as to increase the likelihood that children will be influenced in the ways that we desire.

Just one word on fantasy or reality, which is our theme for today. From a fair amount of research that I've been involved in and from research of others that I've read I would say that we should never say of a bit of programming that it is fantasy *or* reality for a child. I think almost all television entertainment for a child is fantasy *and* reality, that is to say there are fantastic elements, there are stories that are obviously fictional and I think very often young children do indeed recognize that. But there is *always* reality, because young children know very well that when unreal characters and fantastic people, dressed say as clowns, or dressed in exotic costumes, find themselves in fantastic settings, perhaps way in the future or way in the past, the way in which people *deal* with one other in entertainment nevertheless carries a lesson of reality as to how we might deal with one another.

As a single instance, if a child sees an obviously fictional, an obviously fantastic story in which another child is shooting a beanshooter at an adult, the child may know very clearly that didn't happen, that's fantasy, that was written as story. But the child may learn at the same time that a child may be quite presumptuous, quite forward, with adults, because that is the reality them of interpersonal relationships that might be found in the same scene.

Michel Cailloux

Pour aborder le sujet dont on parle qui est "Réalité ou Fantaisie", j'ai des idées qui sont peut-être préconçues mais je crois beaucoup à la fantaisie d'une émission pour enfants. Je pense que le but premier d'une émission pour enfants, c'est de distraire. Distraire, ça veut dire sortir de son contexte et le contexte habituel d'un enfant étant la réalité qui l'entoure, je pense que le premier moyen de distraire un enfant c'est de l'emmener au pays de la fantaisie.

C'est pourquoi en général ce que je fais, en tant que petit auteur, ce sont des émissions où on parle beaucoup de fantaisie. Je pense qu'à travers la fantaisie, on peut faire passer tous les messages qu'on veut. Si, dans l'émission Bobino, je veux expliquer quelque chose — par exemple, ce que c'est qu'un puits de pétrole — si je le fais de manière didactique, ce sera rébarbatif, pas pour tous les enfants, il y en a qui aiment ça, il y en a qui aiment s'instruire, mais il y en a qui, au départ, n'aiment pas ça. Alors, pour ceux qui n'aiment pas ça, il faut le faire discrètement. Pour le faire discrètement, la meilleure façon c'est de le faire à travers la fantaisie. Par exemple, j'ai un personnage qui s'appelle Bobino qui va le faire d'une manière très sérieuse mais, à côté, la fantaisie va être apportée par le petit personnage qui s'appelle Bobinette qui — comprenant — mais, pour faire passer le message, va fabriquer un puits de pétrole qui marchera avec du jus de pomme, par exemple. C'est de cette façon que je vois une manière didactique d'aborder les enfants. On parle de Réalité ou Fantaisie, je pense que les enfants de trois ans à dix ans vont davantage vers la fantaisie que ceux qui sont un peut plus âgés. De trois à dix ans c'est l'âge ou on aime les contes de fée parce qu'on les aime toujours; les contes de Perrault ou les contes de Grimm sont toujours à l'honneur pour les enfants, ils les aiment et je suis très heureux

lorsque je peux écrire des contes qui seront dans l'esprit de Perrault ou de Grimm comme j'essaie de le faire dans la série que vous avez maintenant qui s'appelle *Nic et Pic*.

Bill Hartley

I was particularly interested in seeing that the theme is fantasy *or* reality because for the past two years I've been making shows on the premise that it doesn't have to be one or the other. That a very successful way to program to children is a combination of fantasy *and* reality. As Michel pointed out he does much the same thing.

The programs that I make are for Saturday morning viewing by 8-12 year olds and I'm sure that different age groups and at different programming times the response to either fantasy or reality would vary. But certainly for 8-12 year olds, Saturday morning at ten o'clock is fantasy time. And during the last two years I have produced two series for exactly that time spot.

In the development stage for each of those series I did a personal analysis of what was available on television in a market like Toronto. My main interest was to find out which elements were common to the successful shows. The most often occurring elements were the same over two seasons.

They were animation obviously, fantasy, comedy, jeopardy and music. And by far the most successful, at least in terms of numbers, were the fantasy-comedy and fantasy-jeopardy programs.

Using that as a starting point, plus some research that we had on that particular target audience and their reaction to variety shows like the Sonny and Cher show, comedy shows — like the reruns of Gilligan's Island and so on — which do very well in the numbers, I've gone off in my particular direction in children's television.

In a way what I am attempting to do, or rather what the team I work with are attempting to do, is similar to the second-generation sitcom that we're familiar with now, like ALL IN THE FAMILY. They deal with reality, some of them really more important social issues, in a comedic satiric framework, and I've found that we can deal with kid reality, things like how to deal with problem solving, value educating — all those things educators talk about nowadays. I've found that that kind of kid reality can be dealt with quite successfully in a comedic-fantasy framework.

And at least from the shows that we're doing at the moment, at least from the limited research that we've done, and from the audience response that it works, I've found that the messages we're trying to put out can be encompassed in the framework that is basically fantasy. We think they are important messages. I would like to throw that into the discussion as the concept of fantasy *and* reality instead of fantasy *or* reality.

October 15, 1975.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Question: Robert Roy
Une des questions qui m'intéresse plus particulièrement c'est jusqu'à quel point croit-on que nous stimulons l'imagination des enfants à travers les émissions *canadiennes*, sachant qu'il y a un conflit important dans ce pays au niveau de l'écoute (il faut d'abord avoir l'auditoire, comme le mentionnait Robert Liebert) et en comparaison de la stimulation, apparente à tout le moins, des émissions américaines?

Sam Rabinovitch
"Stimulate imagination" — what does that mean? Do kids sit there and adrenalin is flowing, molecules are bumping, what do you mean, 'stimulate'? Is sitting in front of a TV set supposed to be a substitute for a drug high?

Or are you talking in more long-range terms? Are you talking about the input into a child's life. There's all kinds of input into that child's life.

What are the objectives of these inputs? And is the TV input something that adds to the child's becoming a different kind of human being, does it add to what that kid will be five years from now?

See, that's what I meant — something like Durrell — that's what I meant — it's a Columbus story — it's overcoming something, building something important to a person. Does TV stimulate growth . . . and is it a good long term investment?

I didn't see too much of that this morning. Certainly telling me about the kids' birthdays hardly stimulated. I suppose it told the kid there's going to be a birthday every year or some such thing.

But I keep sitting and watching those programs and saying to myself "what is trying to be accomplished here — is it just because a kid's amused?" How long can we get away with that crap?

Question:
I'm asking a question more on production value. I notice most of the programs we saw this morning had character identification. Either they were using a puppet, or a central character who was on every week. And the great comparison I see between — let's say this is a slower type of production than SESAME STREET, which is high animation and lots of movement. Bring those two ideas together of slow identification and the high animation magic TV programming, which appeals more to a child and which stimulates faster? Are we really into a problem that if we don't have the money we can't have high production, or is one just as valid as the other? I'm in a conflict here because if you don't have the money you can't do the high production. Are you really achieving anything without the high production values in today's watching?

Michel Cailloux
D'abord, vous citez des émissions qu'on a vu ce matin. C'est assez difficile de faire une critique de ce qu'on a vu quand elle risque d'être négative. Personnellement, j'ai vu des marionnettes qui, à mon avis, n'étaient pas faites pour éveiller l'enfant à la beauté de la vie. Un enfant de trois ans à qui on montre des personnages qui ont un côté monstrueux, au départ, je me demande si c'est ce qu'on doit faire. Je préfère montrer à un enfant un beau côté, lui donner de jolies marionnettes. Question d'argent, bien sûr, il est difficile de faire des émissions qui ne soient pas de fantaisie, des émissions de réalité, disons.

Actuellement, si on dit qu'un enfant s'intéresse beaucoup aux fusées, s'il s'intéresse à un monde qui est celui de l'interplanétaire, par exemple, on ne peut pas faire des émissions qui soient réelles, vraiment concrètes parce que ça coûterait une fortune. A ce moment-là, on est obligé de tomber dans la fantaisie et je crois que dans la fantaisie, avec des décors en carton, en évitant les sujets concrets justement, en tombant dans la *vraie* fantaisie, on peut réussir à faire des émissions relativement à bas prix.

Bill Hartley
It's a confusing question. I know what you're saying and I'm probably going to answer a couple of other questions. A thing that happens with children's TV that doesn't have to happen with adult TV is that it all has to be very good which – there should be room for both – low production shows that are good will find their audience – and also the high production. But there have been many of those which haven't found an audience and die quickly too. Somebody else pursue that.

Arthur Weinthal
If I can comment on the question that you raise, ultimately when dealing with programmers and producers we have to deal with the fact a program costs X number of dollars to produce.

I saw a show in Los Angeles which was the standard set puppet show, hand-puppet show, a guy standing with two little puppets, a spider and one was a bird, and the kind of set you've seen a hundred times, whether it's produced locally or by a regional group of stations. And this chap was talking to the spider that came down from the tree and perched on his shoulder. And the spider was complaining that the bird was going away for the summer and he was all alone.

The entire half hour show was the guy talking to the spider about a friend who was going away for the summer and about people who go away and leave you. And where have they gone, and what are they doing, and how do you feel about it, and so on.

It was the same setting a *very* inexpensive, an incredibly inexpensive show, but there was an energetic and imaginative mind working on it. And that I think is what is required. I think that kind of direction of though is what is more required than thinking in terms of building massive sets and things like that.

They were discussing the kinds of feelings kids have when friends go away. And there was intelligence, there was sensitivity and native wisdom about the performer that made the thing work.

I think that's one way of dealing with it.

Joy Simons
I write *Mr. Dressup* for CBC and French inserts for *Sesame Street*, so I feel I have a valid comment to make about the question to do with cost and whether the value of the program is related to the cost. Mr. Dressup is worked on a very very minimum budget and yet it is known to be the cornerstone of the English network programming for children. Unfortunately we haven't had one to screen in the last two days.

It has value because the people working on it care so much about children that they can bring across without the use of TV gimmickry the qualities and the human value that is perhaps missing in programs that are produced with large budgets.

Sesame Street has a huge budget compared with Mr. Dressup and yet I would suggest that it has no greater impact on developing a sense of dignity within the child viewer than *Mr. Dressup* which has a very small budget.

Robert Roy
Comme le disait Robert Liebert, la première question est d'avoir l'auditoire et un des problèmes de ce pays est que plusieurs de nos émissions n'obtiennent pas l'auditoire. C'est ce que j'entends, ce que je lis et nous disons toujours que ce sont les émissions américaines qui enlèvent les cotes d'écoute.

C'est pourquoi je n'ai voulu vous montrer que des émissions canadiennes pour que nous puissions les analyser et voir si nous réalisons nos intentions. Stimulons-nous suffisamment l'imagination de l'enfant pour qu'il puisse choisir de regarder une de ces émissions plutôt que d'autres émissions?

Ce problème dépasse la frontière canadienne pour se retrouver également dans plusieurs pays de l'Europe. Est-ce uniquement une question d'argent? Je ne le crois pas. Mais est-ce autre chose? Que peut-on en dire après les visionnements d'hier après-midi et de ce matin?

Je voudrais ajouter un commentaire personnel. Je me rappelle qu'il y a deux ans, à Munich, nous avions accordé un premier prix à une émission africaine. Pour moi, l'aspect le plus important de cette émission était le bonheur de ces enfants, vivant pleinement l'émission, vivant une expérience leur permettant de s'exprimer de diverses façons. Certaines choses étaient difficiles à faire mais ils aimaient les faire. Ils ont apprécié l'expérience, leur hôte avait une très forte personnalité, il était gentil, charmant, chaleureux.

Nous avons reçu ce commentaire du peuple africain: "Vous êtes peut-être d'un pays *surdéveloppé* quand vous parlez de nous, Africains, comme de sous-développés".

Robert Liebert
Well, it seems to me that we're talking about almost a fundamental conflict or division of opinion in what we might envision as a really good TV program.

At one end for attracting a television audience you could say television is after all a small motion picture, notwithstanding MacLuhan, and what the motion picture did was not give us a chance to stimulate our imaginations further, it *deprived* us of our imaginations...The greatest opportunity to use your imagination is to read a story.

Next comes having the story read to you. We have less room for imagination there because the voice of the reader contributes *its* imagination, and therefore deprives us with some opportunity to imagine on our own. Then came the radio program where we have varied voices and sound effects, and we were further deprived of the opportunity to use our imaginations as someone else's image now became more real through these variations. Come television, and we have less and less opportunity to use our own imagination. Someone else offers us their fantasy, complete with costume, complete with sound effects, and on it goes...The question then becomes "Can you retrieve the situation enough to use this motion picture, sound, special effects medium to give the child back his imagination"?

And I think that is an extremely difficult order.

It is possible but it is extremely difficult.

If you were to ask me to consult in the making of a TV program that was going to be a motion picture, I could give you a lot of suggestions, detailed

research suggestions which you might be able to work with, as creative people, for shaping to your own needs. But if you ask me, without all of the trappings, without all of the fanciness, "How would you use TV in a simple format to stimulate a child's imagination?" I'd be stuck with telling you you have to find people such as the principal character of the African program that we had the pleasure to see. You have to find people of great talent and great sensitivity. And most likely that will be difficult. The great majority of people that you find for hosts and hostesses are not going to be able to do it. And I can see the characteristics of those who have that unique talent but I have no idea how to tell you to go about cultivating that talent.

I think I am in part just pointing out that we literally *do* lose room for imagination. I remember the radio program *the Shadow* and when Lamonte Cramston wasn't invisible he looked like something. And in my mind's eye he was a much more interesting person that you'd ever get on the screen.

So in that sense it's almost logical that we're deprived of imagination. And on another level though, educators are continually reporting, at least in United States, that children show a reduced willingness to use their imagination and *much* more they are *copying* the very direct models with which they're provided.

And when you ask for imagination, when you ask the child to fill in the balnks, when you ask the child to take steps on her or his own, there seems to be in the mind of many thoughtful educators greater resistance and a lowered willingness to do so, which might in part be put to television and the motion picture and that kind of entertainment which makes no demands.

When you think of *Sesame Street*, which is the model there is rather a striking piece of research that was done in Israel that suggests that SESAME STREET, in its goal of teaching children to better deal with school, is actually producing one clear disadvantage. And it is this. When children who have been exposed to large amounts of *Sesame Street* are asked to solve a problem in which you've presented with a wide environment and you have to search that environment and find the important thing that will lead you to a solution, they find it more difficult to do so than comparable children who have seen little or no *Sesame Street*.

Why? Because here in a literal sort of way the camera deprives you of your imagination. For the *camera* in *Sesame Street* searches the environment and you don't have to do so. It finds the important parts of the environment and you aren't required to do so and in that way it actually runs contrary to that kind of stimulation.

And I think it's the kind of thinking that leads me to suggest that at least many types of television can and in a few areas have been shown, to deprive children of something I would call imagination or the stimulation of imagination.

Question
Would you apply the same sorts of criteria to plays and ballet and opera as stultifier of imagination in children?

Robert Liebert
It really does depend on the play. Certainly the legitimate theatre requires much more of *my* imagination than television programming does. And even when we have a motion picture of a well-known play, if you compare that to what you see in a legitimate theatre, the motion picture is designed to do more of it for you.

The sets leave less to your imagination. They have stimulated more the imagination of the people who have created them.

Ken O'Bryan
I'm wondering whether or not the point is more, not that television presents a cut-and-dried version, but the *tendency* has been to produce cut-and-dried versions. That some of the Japanese work in early stimulation, for example, in picture and sound uses the medium quite intelligently to create and evoke an imaginative response.

Robert Liebert
I would agree. Indeed, if anything, I suppose through very much of a back door I am suggesting to you that you might well want to think about using television so as to legitimately stimulate imagination. I think we have too little of that and that's really where creative talent is badly needed and I think would do a great deal for television.

Ken O'Bryan
Could I just change tack just for a moment then, because I want to get back to the fantasy-reality question. In your original statement you indicated, I think, that it wasn't so much a question of fantasy and reality as what the child *extracted* from either the fantasy or the reality. And you hinted at studies of research which indicated that the child extracted many things that the adult did not expect. And I wonder if you would comment on that and its relevance to this sort of work.

Robert Liebert
Yes. I'll give you an example that in many ways has been quite wholesome for me. It happens that it too comes from *Sesame Street*. And I should tell you that I have no involvement with that program and have never been commissioned to do any work either for them or against them. But it did happen that a woman, Teresa Silverman, came to my office. She had done a dissertation in California and found herself in New York City and wanted to discuss it because her sponsors for the research had been the U.S. National Association of Broadcasters, and they had funded her, without interfering, to study the little cooperative segments in *Sesame Street*, presumably with the goal of demonstrating that indeed they did make children more cooperative.

What Silverman found was that for the younger children in her study, and they were about 3 years of age, children were exposed to SESAME STREET program in which these cooperative segments appeared became *less* cooperative than other comparable children who saw SESAME STREET but without these inserts.

That was, of course, quite contrary to what the adult producers of the program intended and indeed they labelled them "cooperation spots".

When we tried to figure out why, and I suggested to her that we might well do a second study together, before she released her first findings, I was frankly concerned about it — some of their socio-political implications — if we can't do it when we *try* let's give the whole enterprise up.

We found that in these snippets of roughly 90 seconds in length the standard sequence went something like this: See two characters, and in vivid action, they are in conflict. For example, two trying to pass over a bridge where only one can

pass at once. That would be roughly 70 of the 90 seconds. The last 20 sec., in *verbal* resolution, indicates that one of the characters will go first and the other go second.

We suspected then that the children – you know, 70 vs. 20 – it's clear what's outweighing it. And research is overwhelming that everything else equal, action is stronger for children than words are.

We then proceeded to a second study so it wouldn't remain at the level of surmise by doing the relatively simple-minded thing of cutting each of these pieces in half. So that some of the children saw only the conflict part and some children saw an enriched view of the solution. And we found very very clearly that the competitive element was making an enormous contribution to reducing cooperation in children.

I think that's a good example of the difference in the kind of comprehension you get from the young child that means that quite beyond our good intentions we need to be very careful and understand the different and more limited perspective of the child when he or she watches television.

Gary Reinblatt

Let's assume in generality three types of programs: those children watch, those that are 'good' for them and those that shouldn't be on the air.

Maybe we should take elements of what people watch, the crass rating game, and combine them with what's "good" for them.

Example is CBS. They do 25 minutes of cartoons, followd by 5 minutes of *In The News*. And there's a good example of taking what they watch and combining it with what's good for them. And I think it's too much for anybody to take 4 hours on Saturday morning of what's good for them. I don't know – simplify. We should mix in – sort of combine the two – you can't have the spinach and the ice cream. Maybe that's oversimplification, but I think it's sort of coming out.

How do you program a block of time Saturday morning from eight to twelve, for a proper mixture?

Sam Rabinovitch

I don't buy the notion that what's good for you can't be enjoyable, can't be entertaining. We've got a whole line of people, writers, playwrights, composers, who manage to combine the two things, popular, and what they've produced for us in the way of plays, books or even movies – Not all movies turn off you imagination. Some movies I've gone to that I've worked on for three or four weeks and we've had practically seminars at home and we're still working on the same movie. So that I don't see why we have to buy such a distinction.

I think the distinction you're making is a condescension to mediocrity because I think that most people in television will buy as a program – 'let the kids watch it and if it's not killing them, if it's not doing them any harm, if it's filling time and maybe if it's keeping the CRTC from jumping down our backs'.

I think those are a whole bunch of euphemisms for second-, third- and fourth-rate stuff. And I think first-rate stuff has for thousands of years in human history been able to combine things that were 'good for people' in the sense that it made them *work*.

What I want from kids from television is to make them work. To make them work at being good kids, to make them work at being good adults, to work at being good oldies.

And that can be enjoyable, and that can be fun and that's, what the hell, life is all about! The rest is junk.

And that's the sad thing – that there are so many people around whose lives are full of junk. But that doesn't mean we have to hold that up as a model. That doesn't mean we have to aim for that. It doesn't mean that we have to go around making excuses for that. I personally don't see why we can't aim high.

Arthur Weintha!

I suppose the program-maker and ultimately the broadcaster is dealing in a large audience-getting circumstance and as long as things are being put in terms of winning an audience, which is essentially by entertaining them, the enrichment values that come with entertainment are few and far between.

It's hard for us to focus, in the context of this particular forum, just on the matter of children's programs being produced in Canada by Canadians for children.

Because in point of fact that probably represents less than 15% of the amount of time children spend watching television. It's also hard in reference to Robert's question about how we get audiences because certainly in English Canada, far more than in French Canada, we are playing in a theatre in which 65% of the seats are facing the back of the auditorium. And that makes it very difficult to stand up on the stage and keep yelling and screaming and flapping your arms around and saying "watch us over here".

Broadcasting circumstances, as everybody here knows, are very complicated in Canada and are being wrestled with and grappled with by many people.

And it's hard when we as program makers and broadcasters and researchers try to focus on just how can we make programs directed for children, better. That is the framework for this particular workshop. You're not dealing with the competitive factors – they *are* realities – nor are we dealing with the kind of impact *adult* shows have on child audiences, although that is a very important question.

The important thing is how do we get braodcasters to do more and better programs directed to children and how do we get people to want to produce, to want to make them. I remember years ago being associated with a television station, I think the same is probably true to a lesser degree now, but nonetheless a little bit true, that when you work at a television station the two things you never want to get caught doing, and if you did you wanted to get out of it as soon as possible, was the LATE NEWS and a kids show.

That was something the juniors came and did. And what you tried to do was get out of there as fast as you could. Well, that kind of thinking doesn't exist now, but a little of it still exists. And to get good producers and good directors and good performers who had a sense of excellence about their work associated with the making of programs for children – that's really a very important by product of this particular conference.

Jack Cennon

m from Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. I just want to say that from a local small area station I don't quite agree about birthdays being crap. We are a local station serving a small area and with children in particular the three minutes that we saw of birthdays I though was quite good for Medicine Hat, with a population of 15,000.

It's a local thing. We're talking very network-wise here. And I think birthday greetings to little kids are very important.

October 16, 1975

PANEL: THEME "WHAT MAKES A GOOD PROGRAM GOOD?"
Chairman: Arthur Weinthal
John Kennedy
Michèle Landsberg
Jean-Paul Ladouceur
Chris Sarson

Arthur Weinthal
There's been a number of statistics thrown at you in the last few days. One of the statistics which I will throw at you is the BBM figure that by the time a child has reached the age of 11 in Canada, these are Canadian figures, he has watched 12,000 hours of television.

In U.S. Dr. Hayakawa reports that by the time a child has reached the age of 18 he has watched 22,000 hours of television.

Dr. Gerald Lesser is a professor of Human Development at Harvard and an advisor of the Children's Television Workshop in the U.S. He has stated that television's great power is the capacity to show the world's children, to display people and events and ideas that they have never encountered before.

This awesome capacity coincides with the oldest of all teaching ideas and one we sometimes lose sight of: the older person telling the younger one. And even better in the television age, showing him the world and points of significance in it.

Well, how well are we doing? Are we doing well? Sometimes it's a question that plagues public broadcasters for different reasons than it plagues private broadcasters.

Today we have brought together a panel of four who will say something on the subject of what makes a good television program good.

John Kennedy
Some of you might have seen a program that we did at the beginning of September called *Children and Television*. I was on the program for a brief moment and was rash enough to say that in the year that I've been Head of Children's Television CBC English Network, I hadn't heard a word from the mothers in the audience, about whether they liked the programs we presented to them, whether they despised them or had any views at all. Since then I've had a steady trickle of very reassuring mail. The volume's not been great but the quality has been.

I answer them immediately and one thing I was happy to do for one woman who had 5 children under 5 and obviously couldn't become involved in the question of television although she would like to because of the time – her leisure and privacy were extremely limited. Nevertheless she devoted an hour and a half of her time to write me a very closely written lengthy letter on what she thought of it. And I told her that the Children's Broadcast Institute would be interested in that kind of mail. And I forwarded that to Joan Soloviov and also advised the woman that she should send that kind of mail to her local newspaper, rather than ending in my files, and with a response. I really thought that her views were worthwhile. And for that reason I really want to thank the directors of CBI for arranging this ambitious affair.

I was gently chided by one of the long time veteran toilers in the vineyards of children's TV last night for not bringing along our preschool programs. I don't

worry so much about our preschool programs frankly. We have an awful lot of programs to do. At the moment my view is that the programs represented by *Mon Ami, Friendly Giant, Mr. Dressup* and Canadian contributions to *Sesame Street* have such a long-standing record themselves, particularly programs like *Friendly* and *Mr. Dressup* that I thought it would be redundant for me to show them to you in view of the fact that so many programs were vying for time on the screen.

What I did hope to share with you was the new type of program that we're offering for what I think is a harder group to program for, namely those from 8 to 12 and sometimes upward of that. And some of the programs I showed at least aim for that group.

There was one other thing I wanted to say before I stop — introduce a note of reality into the kinds of decisions one in my position has to make in regard to what gets on the air, and what doesn't.

Recently, I was talking to a number of television students at Ryerson and I was challenged by one student and really brought up short. Because he said "I think CBC is only giving lipservice to children's programs" and he said "don't you agree? I was on the spot because there is a way in which it can be interpreted that way and I suggested that perhaps he wasn't aware of the volume of our schedule.

We do 20 hours a week. We do from 9-12 in the morning, with input from OECA, but basically 9-12 every morning all through the week. Saturday mornings we're on the new network program on film from 10.30 to 12. Every afternoon of the week there are 10 slots from 4.30 to 5.30 each day and we're programming those. We're not into Sunday yet at all, these things are further down the road. I was pointing that out, but he didn't really buy it. I said, "but we've been doing that for 20 years, that kind of dedication. I mean there's a lot of dedicated people who have been making programs specifically for children in this period of time."

But he was really getting down to it. He wasn't impressed by all the talk of specific programs that we were doing. He wanted to know what sort of priority does CBC give programs for children. I'm speaking here of CBC ESD I said, "Well of course, I do it, and all our department is serious dedicated people in that area".

"Oh yes," he said, "but you're not the CBC. By priority, I mean how much money do you get to make the programs compared to, say drama or current affairs or sports, and so on?"

Well, I didn't tell him. But I can tell you, because I've looked it up since. In CBC Children's Television we are responsible for about 1,000 hours a year and Current Affairs is responsible for about 300 hours. So we have more than three times the amount of time to fill on about half the money.

The comparison with Drama is even better. They get twice the budget in order to fill about one-tenth the hours. Sports get twice as much budget and fill about half the time.

Now I wouldn't want to take from any of those areas, they need every penny they can get, but in children's we could sure use priority attention from senior management. Indeed, I have every expectation that we'll get it. We've been told that Children's is the next area to be studied for priority attention.

One hopes that it will show up in more ambitious projects a few years from now. Like more dramatic films for kids, more commissioned animation, more music, more documentaries and so on.

Michèle Landsberg

I'm one of those concerned mothers that John has been hearing from and I don't have expertise from within your field. I'm an outside commentator, so my comments are from those of the consumer and a parent who worries about television. Good television for children takes kids seriously and that's why everything in a good children's television program is thought out and has cohesiveness.

I think a bad children's program will have all sorts of stuff thrown in to make noise, fill space, take time. There'll be clowns or zoos or lord knows what that's not related to anything else that goes on in the program. The Cookie Monster is so effective and loved by the audience because it relates to a real childhood fear that is made gentle and tame and manageable.

But an ugly puppet, a stupid cheap puppet is just there because that's some adult's idea of how to fill up kid space that doesn't relate to the child's needs.

I think a good kid's program doesn't saturate the child with hectic noise and spectacle and display but rather seeks to involve the child in an ongoing scene or action. Good kids' TV helps a child to explore her inner self and not only to explore it but stimulate her to explore the world outside her after the program.

Programs like *Mr. Dressup* and *Zoom* had a great emphasis on child's natural play. They took it seriously and elucidated it and enriched it. And after the program, after these good and excellent programs, the child would often turn off the set and run to play and elaborate those play scenes for the rest of the day. And that's got to be the highest praise for a good kids television program.

I also think it's terribly important that a good program reflects back to the child an accepting and loving image of childhood. Casey on *Mr. Dressup* is a real child, with a real child's ways, wilfulness, bad tempered occasionally, fears, misunderstandings, but the child is clearly accepted and loved just as a child, and that is why *Mr. Dressup* is loved.

The same is so of *Zoom*. It showed children in a very unaffected way as worthy people worth listening to. So that when you see these cutesy saccharine moppets mouthing and mugging for the camera or all dolled up in their Sunday best this is an offense to the child viewer, I think. And when you see the little suckers being conned and manipulated that's also an offense and bad taste in TV programming.

And the tipoff is what I call the "teacher voice". "Now children, we'll all sit in our lovely circle" and when you hear that syrupy teacher's voice that's the mark of an unrelated adult, an adult who is not relating to or caring for any real child.

Real action adventure children need this to sense their own powers, capabilities, their own possibilities, their power to solve problems, to become more human. And so if we have grimacing and hollering adults in place of real adventure that's bad TV.

And feverish hectic excitement falsely generated either by kid actors or adults, that's another tipoff that it's bad TV.

A program like *Nic Et Pic* is real action adventure in which the child's heart and mind is involved and expanded. Nobody's projecting an adult fantasy for the child. They're taking the child's most crucial fantasies and enriching them.

There are a lot of ugly adult fantasies that are laid on children in TV like the cartoon *Jeannie* and we have to be particularly careful that adults don't act out their own needs and desires and palm it off as good TV.

I think affection is crucial for preschoolers and that's why *Captain Kangaroo* and *Mr. Dressup* and *Mister Rogers* have been so outstandingly successful

because they conveyed a real affection for the child and the children responded. And that needs special people, who care.

The standards for children's TV *are* different. You do have greater responsibilities and different ones so you need to use not just television expertise but child expertise as well. And maybe that's a responsibility you don't have in adult television. I think what Bob Keeshan said last night is so deeply true about special responsibility.

Humour which isn't abrasive and mocking and smart alecky grownup but humour that is gentle and illuminates human things is very important for a children's program. I'm sure you all know that.

Professionalism, there's a lot of amateurism palmed off on children, thinking they won't know the difference. It says that their aesthetic sensibilities don't matter, and they *do* matter, terribly, and so it would be better to have a completely empty set than cheap junk.

I say that a good children's program is not interrupted by commercials and I know you can tell me all the reasons they have to be but that's my standard as a parent. If the flow of the program, the creative energy the people have put into it, is interrupted to sell something to kids — and that's a disgusting activity at the best of times — but if a good program is interrupted by a television commercial then it ceases to be such a good program. And if there have to be commercials then you have to find a better way to do it than interrupting a scene that's developing and might be important to the child viewer.

And I don't have time to say all the things that I want to but I say in an important way a good program validates a child's own experience of the world. I remember vividly when my kids saw a little Jewish kid on *Zoom* baking bread and they were thrilled beyond words because it was the first time they ever saw reflected back to them on television a simple and real joy of their own life. And of course how many kids could you do this with — showing them other children — not slick actors but other real children whose contribution to society is obviously valued.

One other thing I'd say is that in all learning situations, especially for small children, relationship is crucial. Nothing happens without relationship so there have to be people who are making programs who genuinely care and know about children. If they aren't there, all the flashy acting in the world won't rescue the program. There have to be relationships.

And the last thing I have to say is that good kids programming is probably expensive. It occasionally happens that some very dedicated people will make a beautiful show on very little money but in order to start and generate more beautiful shows we need a lot more money. And please do talke to the brass about it.

Jean-Paul Ladouceur

Depuis 34 ans, je me promène à l'intérieur du monde du spectacle; durant 20 de ces années j'ai eu la grande joie de travailler à l'intérieur de la programmation enfantine. J'ai vu naître la grosse machine qui, aujourd'hui, pond des sons et des images comme la poule aux oeufs d'or. Contrairement à certaines remarques que j'ai entendues, les plus belles années de ma vie, les plus rassurantes ont été celles que j'ai consacré uniquement aux enfants, ces spectateurs uniques, les meilleurs, les plus fidèles qu'on puisse trouver.

Et pour ceux d'entre vous qui croyez encore que le monde des adultes est un monde où les moyens sont plus grands, où les responsables vous écoutent plus

sérieusement, je vous proposerai seulement d'essayer d'aller vendre, chez les adultes, à un directeur des programmes, un "Téléchrome", par exemple. Hier, j'essayais de trouver une réponse à votre question. Une réponse sans émotivité basée seulement sur l'expérience de ces années: "qu'est-ce qu'une bonne émission?".

Pour avoir vu avorter, pour avoir vu naître et mourir des centaines d'émissions, je n'ai peut-être pas les mêmes préoccupations que vous. Je ne cherche même plus de solution aux sources. Il y a aujourd'hui de meilleurs créateurs, de meilleurs producteurs, de meilleurs comédiens et même de budgets supérieurs à ceux d'autrefois.

Je considère qu'il n'y a pas de véritable problèmes aux sources. Créer une bonne émission, c'est relativement facile. Mais de cette créativité doit naître un bon projet et un bon projet n'est pas une bonne émission. C'est à ce carrefour qu'une émission choisit d'être bonne. Pour moi, une bonne émission, c'est celle qui aura une qualité de survivance, une qualité d'étonnement et ces qualités lui seront données par ses protagonistes. Il faudra que celui ou ceux qui l'auront créée réussissent à convaincre, en les étonnant, ceux qui détiennent les cordons de la bourse. Et il faudra, en respectant les critères pédagogiques, créateurs et pratiques, de chaque émission qu'elle renouvelle l'étonnement auprès de ceux qui la regardent et de ceux qui la gardent. Si elle intéresse constamment les deux parties, elle vivra longtemps. Si les producteurs d'émissions enfantines mettaient le même talent à se justifier auprès des administrateurs qu'ils en mettent à convaincre les enfants d'être leurs spectateurs, il y aurait sûrement plus de bonnes émissions.

Malheureusement, plusieurs d'entre nous adoptons une attitude de douce persécution, de résignation devant ce que nous qualifions d'incompréhension. Le monde des adultes est une jungle, comparativement à celui des enfants. Et je ne connais aucun directeur de programmes qui refusera une émission qui aidera à améliorer l'image de sa station. Cette image, elle est faite autant des profits que du "P.R." Je crois qu'une bonne émission est celle qui sait survivre et cette survivance est dirigée par un ou des personnages convaincus, qui savent bien vendre leur salade. C'est, à une échelle réduite, un problème de persuasion, étayant un produit nécessaire de qualité.

Chris Sarson

I'd like to talk about talent and the use to which you put talent to make a good children's program.

One of my heroes is John Wesley who founded the Methodist Church and one of the things that impressed me about him was the way that he answered the critics who spoke about the money that he would get from the people that he converted, who often were prostitutes and gamblers and had got ill gains from means of living that weren't considered good in those days. He said "It's not where the money comes from" when the critics said "How can you use this money for God's work?" "It's not where the money comes from it's the use to which it's put". And the moral for me in children's television isn't that talent is important as the use to which it is put.

I think all of us have talent. It's knowing how to apply that to children's television that concerns me most. Three quick examples. In animation there's some very talented people turning out *Sabrina And The Ghoulie Ghoulies* and *Roadrunner* and programs like that. And there are talented animators at the National Film Board, or at the SRC. It's not the talent it's the use to which it is put.

There's a lot of talent in research, but it's how you use the research to me that's interesting and important. Research can be a stepping-stone which you can absorb and then step onto the higher plateau of making a program, or it can be a millstone that completely drowns you in the science of how the audience is going to react to the program.

The question of children on the screen – you can manipulate them like puppets on the one side or you can let them share their enthusiasm for life on a children's program. It's not the fact that children are on the screen, it's what they're doing on the screen and how they project themselves that's important.

To me there's no set formula for a good program. But I'd like to share the questions I ask myself when I make a program and because I'm a simple-minded chap I'll put them in the form of A B C.

The A is the Audience, and as Michèle said, the important thing is the involvement of the audience. The fact that the child feels part of the program, as opposed to feeling the recipient of this barrage of audio and visual information that comes to him. If the child can participate in the program, so much the better.

If he phones a friend and says "Gosh, Jim, you've missed the best program in the whole wide world!" the moment the program finishes, that's participation.

The B is Beyond. It involves the things we've all talked about especially in educational television of stretching the imagination and breaking down the classroom walls and putting a window on the world and all that kind of thing. These are trite phrases. Beyond this, what appeals to me most is something that is beyond the reach of the child, something that is stimulating to him, yet it's still within – it's beyond the grasp of the child but still is within their *reach*.

And the C is Content. Ask yourself as you're about to make the program "Is the content compelling?" and "is it relevant to the child, is it important to him, will it mean something to him?" And above all, "is it entertaining and is it fun?"

You know, the more programming that I see on broadcast television that I see for children, whether it's in England or America or Canada, the more impressed I am, not with the programming itself, but with the children, who it seems to me have miraculously an incredible resilience and fortitude and determination to grow up into decent human beings in spite of the meaningful efforts of their elders and betters to educate and entertain them.

At conferences like this I think we see the other side of the coin. The potential of television and in some cases the cream of good programming. *Téléchrome* and the program with Gerald Durrell come immediately to mind. That is talent, and the way to which it is put brings a sparkle to our eye and joy to our hearts and that to me is what makes a television program good.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Don Forsyth
A question of Jean-Paul Ladouceur. You finished your statement with something of the problem of persuasion. Would you just elaborate, persuading what, and who?

Jean-Paul Ladouceur
Ce que je voulais dire — et c'est ce que j'ai constaté à la NFB, à CBC et dans l'entreprise privée — c'est que les gens qui font la programmation pour enfants ont tendance à ne pas tout mettre en oeuvre pour vendre leur produit au directeur des programmes, ou à quiconque dispose des budgets, autant, du moins, que ceux qui font les émissions pour adultes. Après un certain temps, ils abandonnent.

S'ils y mettent assez d'enthousiasme et de conviction, ils réussiront à vendre leurs émissions. Il s'agit, lorsque vous avez un bon produit, de savoir persuader et convaincre les commanditaires. Cependant, la plupart du temps, après quelques tentatives, ils abandonnent et disent qu'ils ne comprennent rien à leur insuccès. Cela s'est produit si souvent que c'en est presque devenu un "pattern".

On compare toujours ceux qui font les émissions pour enfants à ceux qui font les autres émissions et le taux d'acceptation des émissions est plus bas en ce qui a trait aux émissions pour adultes qu'il l'est pour celles destinées aux enfants.

Celui qui doit vendre une émission sportive à son directeur des programmes, fait face, à mon avis, à plus de difficultés que celui qui doit vendre une émission pour enfants à l'intérieur de l'organisme auquel il est attaché.

John Kennedy
I'm responsible for programming the afterschool periods and I'm limited to the extent that they're half-hour programs, that the amount of money to program them is not too great.

I'm trying to engender interest in making innovative bright programs for children eleven to twelve — hoping that if we make programs for children that age, the eights and nines will follow along.

We also have special programs for those six to eight. And that whole thing about the developmental level and what kind of programs you're offering for those is important in our case. I think of *Nic And Pic* being of interest to those five and six and maybe seven. *Alligator Pie* would have a greater age range. *Stationary Ark*, the younger ones might get something out of that — just the presence of Gerald Durrell himself, I think is a big plus in that one.

Obviously the older you are the more you are going to get out of that program. Margery King just said that she thought that was an adult program. But she meant that it wasn't exclusively adult, that indeed OECA is offering it at 8 o'clock prime time.

In each of these slots I'm thinking, or traditionally the CBC has been thinking, of special age groups and I guess they require excitement, they require investigation, wonder, all these things, and these are hard to make into formulas. Each one that we make is one of a kind, a special customized product that we're making, nothing we can stamp out.

There's not much talk about Art in this but I think that's what we're really into, and you can't apply too much criteria, you can't make up too many components to put in and make a prescription that's going to be great for eight to twelves.

Jean-Paul Ladouceur
Vous avez mentionné que la télévision de langue française produit peut-être plus d'émissions, a peut-être un budget plus élevé et fait peut-être davantage d'efforts que la télévision de langue anglaise. J'aimerais demander à Robert Roy ou à John Kennedy si cette différence est proportionnelle à la réponse de l'auditoire.

Si le réseau français fournit plus d'efforts, de réalisateurs, d'auteurs, la réponse de l'auditoire est-elle supérieure à celle que reçoit le réseau anglais?

Robert Roy
Je ne ferai aucun commentaire sur la première question, au sujet des budgets et des employés. Je n'en sais rien. Mais je dirai que je crois fermement à ce que vous avez dit précédemment, il faut être très convaincu pour convaincre. Je suis là depuis cinq ans, mais depuis 1952 — quand vous y étiez aussi — les gens ont été convaincus.

C'est une longue histoire, et tous ces gens dont vous parliez ont aussi été là depuis vingt ans. Ce qui est très important selon moi, c'est que nous ayons eu la foi au départ. Comme je dis souvent, je ne me bats pas contre les gens, je me bats avec eux et c'est pour moi la seule façon de travailler.

Au sujet de la réponse de l'auditoire: regardez les cotes d'écoute; uniquement au point de vue quantitatif, je ne parle pas ici de qualité; quand je dis que Nic et Pic rejoint 800,000 personnes dont 700,000 sont des enfants, chez les Canadiens — anglais, dont la population est trois fois plus nombreuse, ou s'étonne: "Comment obtenez-vous ce résultat?" Je ne sais pas. Les faits sont là, ils y ont été, c'est une tradition. Qu'on veuille juger, évaluer les émissions, qu'on en attribue le succès à quelque raison que ce soit, les faits sont là.

Mais nous avons fait aussi ce que j'appellerais un "effort désintéressé". Et c'est *Téléchrome*. Je savais que nous n'atteindrions pas un million de téléspectateurs avec *Téléchrome*. Je voulais qu'on en rejoigne 300,000 et nous en avons rejoint 400,000. Mais ce n'était pas une émission commerciale au sens où on l'entend très souvent.

Jean-Paul Ladouceur
Ce que je tente de déterminer c'est que les gens ici ont une idée en tête: obtenir toujours plus d'argent. Si nous *obtenons* plus d'argent recevrons-nous davantage de réponse de l'auditoire? Et si nous obtenons plus d'argent, aurons-nous des émissions de qualité, de meilleures émissions pour le *même* nombre de personne, ou aurons-nous de meilleures réactions? Est-ce que nous établirons un rapport plus solide avec les clients, qui sont les enfants?

Arthur Weinthal
One of the things I have been conscious of in this workshop is that programs introduced in the French language serve an audience that deal in an entirely different environment than an English audience.

Last night the producers of *Nic Et Pic* asked Bob Keeshan to look at their show and they asked him to look at the English version, the dubbed version, partly for his judgment, whether he thought it was a good program but also because they wanted to know how did he think that program would compete on the English network of the CBC with what the competiton is, which is *Hogan's Heroes* and *Gilligan's Island*, and god knows what else. And I think the French producer in this particular case specifically came to realize that the moment that

show left Quebec and went out into the English Canadian television world it was going to be bombarded by all kinds of new competitive problems.

I wanted to ask Jean Paul, because you've had years of experience, producing programs in every sector, how do you characterize in general terms, the English language programs and the French language programs? Do you see discernible differences? Is one better than the other? Can you make any evaluation?

Jean-Paul Ladouceur
No, I see no difference. I mean a good program in any language is a good program. You will look at the Trinka puppet show, it will go in any language, French, English, it will go over because it's good.

The point you brought up about English competition, yes, I agree to that, the audience in Montreal is more captive and I believe that the test of real quality is in competition, and dubbing for Robert may make him light up a few bulbs and have him change some ways of thinking. Because if you do work with a captive audience it is a completely different problem than if you go network. And we were having a discussion yesterday and a gentleman from Prince Albert was saying this program was one he was doing in his back yard, and I agree with him.

Janis Dunning
I would just like to suggest that some of the qualities for children's programming that we are all saying we would like to see *are* being experimented with in lots of stations across Canada, and the difficulty is that because they are innovative — and they are experimenting in direct relationships between children in television and children at home, like we are trying to do with our *Let's Go* program — because they are different and don't fit into a commercial slot, producers aren't ready to show it because they don't see any economical value, a slot to push it into. Like adult programming which is classified and is either a flashy entertainment show or it's a sitcom or something. When new programs don't fit into these slots it's difficult to get them shown. So what do we do with these children's programs when we've got them made?

Arthur Weinthal
I think it's important that local stations produce local programs and not every program has to run on the network to be successful. There's an important community activity that has to go on either locally or regional and where there's some prestige associated with being on a network the fact is that that particular program which you're referring to, coming from Winnipeg, is doing a very significant job in Winnipeg. Anyway, I'll let someone else comment on that.

Janis Dunning
I'd just like to say that it's economic too. We're saying we need more money for this kind of programming so if the station puts out more money to get some quality in its programs, and it needs more and more all the time to improve the quality as we develop the program, then of course they want some return on it.

Chris Sarson
Only a piece of personal experience. There are two sides to it. McDonald's, who I think underwrote our banquet, also underwrote *Zoom*, so I have a very soft

spot for them, not the product, but the intentions behind the product. Fred Turner, the president in Chicago, gives every employee every year a motto which has to be stuck on the wall, and the one for this year is PERSISTENCE IS ALL.

It's what Jean Paul was saying. His little screed ran that there was talent lying around on the roadside and talent all over the place but what succeeded in the world was persistence.

As an illustration of that I have to tell you that when *Zoom* started it was an idea in the back of my head for a good number of years and the main reason it didn't get off the ground is because there weren't any adults in it — and obviously children couldn't do a television program all by themselves or they'd fall flat on their faces! And public television didn't want to invest in it. Until I got a commercial local station interested in doing enough of a pilot that it turned out they weren't interested in because I didn't use their adult host as much as they wanted, *that* shocked public television into giving us the money for the first program. PERSISTENCE!

QUESTION
I have a question for Mr. Sarson. What is the most useful role research can play to promote and improve children's educational broadcasts?

Chris Sarson
You should have been in Don Forsyth's room at three this morning. We were going hammer and tongs at this very question. I think everybody uses it in different ways. I use it for information. I use it to base decisions on. I started *Zoom*, but programming in general, very much from an instinctive feel and my own personal research into getting to know children in work and in play and that kind of thing.

Research for me codified that and put it in a form that I found useful. And always bearing in mind that I feel that I as the producer am the ultimate on the line. The person who is responsible for the program as the producer on the air can reject the research finding and go my own sweet way, and of course, if the research turns out to be right they'll point the finger and say "I told you so" but that's a gamble you have to take.

At the moment I'm planning a program on old people, just coming to the final script stage, which hopefully will change attitudes of people in America about what we think about old people. I'm fascinated to know what other programs who have purpoted, or maybe inadvertently *have* changed attitudes, what research there is that I can draw on to act as a stepping stone to move off in my own area. Archie Bunker and *All In The Family* is an obvious example that has that changed attitude in that particular format within that particular sphere. Does that answer the question?

John Kennedy
I think that the kind of research that I'd be interested in and the producers who work in our department — we've got twelve producers in Toronto and some of the regional ones from time to time are able to contribute — I think researchers — students — I tell them to watch the programs just as viewers. If you can watch them with children, so much the better. Observe. Because any producer wants to hear anything you've got to say about that program.

I think this is after the program is on the air is where it's at — a going concern.

If it's a series the producer has time to respond to the kinds of observations you might make to him.

Hopefully, if it's a new series coming on that you deal with the producer or the program director ahead of time. You as professional researchers talk with those people and try to come to some project design that is useful from your academic scholarly point of view and is useful from the point of view of the producer.

This season we've got a lot of new programs. We've got one shot programs like *Alligator Pie* and *Almighty Voice* which I'm extremely interested in as pilot kinds of experiences. Similarly with the program *Speaking Out*. I'm not skilled in designing a research project but I would certainly be welcome to talk to students about where they could be helpful.

CBC has its own research division. All our research facilities seem to be swamped — so we have no time to sit down and develop these and do things ourselves — we get numbers — There's different kinds of research that is helpful, even those kinds, you aren't interested in those kinds of things yourself, I know. It helps us as programmers sometimes to change the time of a program or to observe what happens. In the summertime, for example, most audiences go downhill. Certainly the big people's programs decline in numbers. But in fact the children's programs go up. This past summer — we regularly have *Mr. Dressup* at 10.30 in the morning and that happened this summer — but also for an experiment we put him on at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon in the summer. He drew more than he'd ever drawn in any other period during the recent run of the show. I mean going back 5 years. That's important. That's when audience fragmentation really started to happen. Nearly all programs lost everything. But he had gained against the tide. I thought that was very significant. So next year that program is going to be there again. In fact in the '76 schedule we're going to have that program one afternoon for the whole year. So that's another kind of research.

Chris Sarson

Two very quick pointers. One to a book which you may be familiar with, *Television and Children* by Gerald Lesser. That's a marvellous case study of how he and Joan Ganz Cooney and then David Connell, the executive producer, of *Sesame Street*, got together and made it happen. It was a stormy first couple of months but gradually the waters calmed and still waters run deep and a lot of good cooperation came out of it. It's useful and good reading.

And the other thing is to talk to Bob Liebert who is here and working in exactly the situation you describe.

QUESTION

I think we've all learned a lot about what the panel thinks is good and bad programming. And although we may disagree we all of us have one common goal and that is to make our programming better, or as best we can. But I'm interested in knowing what the panel thinks are steps the CBI can take to do

better. What specific steps can they take, other than just a conference where we meet interesting people and have a good exchange of ideas? What can we do in terms of money, research and so on?

Michèle Lansberg

I'd love to see the CBI rally parents in some way. The industry has talked enough now and goodness knows people in the industry already know these things. So let's rally the parents and the people out there who are concerned and form some sort of lobby or pressure group that will pressure the network and the CRTC to say what *we* want for our kids. And if the CBI does that it will be doing something that hasn't been done yet in Canada, that needs to be done.

I don't think it should concentrate on internal research and discussion but it should reach out into the public and try to get people involved.

Yes, I second that. And I think when you were introducing Chris Sarson you might well this year have introduced him as the husband of Evelyn Sarson, one of the co-founders of ACT, Action for Children's Television. It seems to me if CBI has as much effect on children's broadcasting as they did that would be an interesting thing.

Personally, I'd like to see if they have a secretariat or an office that has a bibliography. We get endless letters from students writing theses of one sort or abother, wanting to know what we think about the Early Childhood Development. And you know, what are we supposed to do, answer as we can and we *do* supply bibliographies. But that kind of material would be very useful for another source, other than CBC, to handle. Correspondence, I spoke earlier about the impassioned letters one gets which would encourage me. And things that have been said this morning encourage me to pound on doors myself in search for more time periods, more budget or more facilites really — this is my main problem just now.

But you have that kind of correspondence, it gets out, it gets published, it doesn't just get into people's files. Obviously it would be a lobby group, that would be an interest group that will conduct public relations, campaigns, promotional campaigns, what it's all about — more and better programs for children.

Chris Sarson

A thousand years ago, it seems, I went to the Guild Inn in Toronto and it was the first CBI conference and I felt that in retrospect as if it was a tiny little child wettings its diapers.

I feel very differently now. I feel it's a husky teenager flexing its muscles. I'm terribly impressed, and I say this on my own — I don't just say it to you guys — I'm terribly impressed that there seems to be an interchange of opinions at meetings like this in Canada. Where the broadcasters and the regulators and the parents and the concerned people get together and don't just spout their own vested interest, everybody always does that but they listen to the other side and sometimes act on it. ACT is a very political group in ways that might be inappropriate for CBI. In that thousand years there has been incredible progress. I don't know what you've been doing from day to day but obviously you've been doing it right. And I think the other thing from a meeting like this what

you've to take away is something that is the D in the alphabetical list of things that concern me, which is DON'T DESPAIR. You know, you get the idea, apply it, and just go out and do it.

Nan-B. de Gaspé Beaubien
I just wanted to add a word to what Chris has said. We really didn't start this off with the same idea as ACT. If you look at the members on our board, I think it is quite unique, as I mentioned the first night. Where people from broadcasting, from the production field, from the consumer field — we like to feel that we can all work together. We don't like to feel that we have to work against one another. And I think this is quite unique and hopefully we will be able to do more and better programming through this unique method.

Nan-B. de Gaspé Beaubien
J'aimerais ajouter quelques mots aux propos de Chris. Nous n'avons vraiment pas mis ceci sur pied avec la même notion d'ACT. Si vous considérez les membres de notre comité, vous remarquerez, comme je l'ai mentionné le premier soir du Colloque, que la formation en est assez unique. Nous sommes des gens de l'industrie de la radiodiffusion, du domaine de la production, du domaine de la consommation et nous aimons sentir qu'on peut travailler tous ensemble. Nous n'aimons pas savoir que nous devons travailler l'un contre l'autre. Je pense que cela est unique et, espérons-le, nous pourrons faire plus et mieux en matière de programmation par cette méthode unique.

October 15, 16, 1975.

WORKSHOP
Building from nothing
Rita Deverell
Janis Dunning

Four recommendations came from this workshop.

A. 1. That producers, puppeteers, on-camera people etc. tour to regions.
or 2. Above personnel work "in-residence" at small stations.
or 3. Above people produce videotapes on how to produce, animate etc. for regions.
or 4. These people conduct intensive work sessions (2 weeks) on specific child TV-related subjects, writing etc., in regions

B. FINANCIAL SUPPORT be given local programming so that it doesn't have to go to the network to survive. It is important to children to have the chance to give feedback to local programs, to have caring people available to them.

C. CHILD PARTICIPATION Programming (*Circlesquare*, *Let's Go*) should be encouraged. Break down management bias against this more unpredictable type of show. Children take it seriously, so should production.

D. CBI should negotiate child on-camera contracts with ACTRA.

October 15, 1975.

WORKSHOP
Reality or Fantasy
Dr. Sam Rabinovitch

POINTS BROUGHT UP:

- the reality-fantasy question is irrelevant
- Are we afraid of fantasy for children because they haven't had the experiences yet to make comparative judgments. An adult can unwind watching violent programming, a child can't. An adult may escape injection of racist attitudes, a child cannot.
- Is fantasy training children to be unrealistic? One school of thought says 'train children to be good adults', another says 'let them enjoy their childhood'. The great thing about the kid is that childhood is the time for DISCOVERY.
- Are TV producers □more concerned about getting ratings than about and caring for children?
- Children 'learn' from animation but are less influenced by its message (good or bad) than by live actors.

Le 16 octobre, 1975

Atelier
Qu'est-ce qu'une bonne émission?
Maurice Falardeau

- La société actuelle ne faisant pas de place à l'expression de l'imagination, les émissions pour enfants stimulent leur imagination créatrice par la recherche et la découverte de l'étonnement, du merveilleux et du fantastique.
- Les émissions devraient être basées sur l'amour des radio-diffuseurs pour les enfants, de telle sorte qu'ils puissent leur présenter un monde plus beau à voir et à entendre.
- A Radio-Canada, la politique de l'équipe des émissions jeunesse est de présenter tout d'abord à l'enfant, plongé dans une réalité didactique toute la journée à l'école, un monde de fantaisie et d'imaginaire.

WORKSHOP
What makes a good program good?
Maurice Falardeau

- are conducted by hosts and people who care for children
- when everybody concerned in the program understands and loves children they are able to introduce them to all kinds of new things and help them appreciate them
- TV should provide stimulus and enrichment that schools can't provide
- TV should be about things that are beyond children's ordinary experience
- good program enriches and validates the child's experience of the world.

October 15, 16, 1975.

WORKSHOP
Who is watching and why?
David Adams
Robert Liebert

DAVID ADAMS gave a few statistics on Canadian children's viewing.

2 yrs to 11 yrs. children watch an average of 3 hrs. a day, 20 hrs. a week. Second only to old people who are TV's heaviest consumers.

WKBW is the favourite viewing station in the Toronto area.

Children's viewing times peak at noon and from 4.30 - 5. On Saturday mornings from 9 - 10. In summertime the noon peak is as high but afternoon and Saturday is lower than winter.

Principal reason for ratings is to indicate to advertisers what value they're getting for their money.

ROBERT LIEBERT
Good quality shows for children are regularly killed by stations who judge them by ratings — quantity response.

Children are attracted to programs of action, jeopardy but they aren't interested in physical violence. It is suspense that keeps them watching. High action programs are violent because advertisers and broadcasters perpetuate the false myth that violence is a needed ingredient. Exhaustive testing with children at his research centre at State University, New York, has proven this.

His research bureau publish their findings and make them available to anyone. It is financed by grants, not by advertisers or program promoters. Findings of their research on the *Lassie* show are available in monograph.

October 15, 16, 1975.

WORKSHOP
Working with Children
Chris Sarson
Bill Hartley

These producers use children in contrasting ways. In *Zoom*, Chris Sarson kept changing its cast and encouraged natural play. Sarson: "first year was a delight in its simplicity, it let the child shine forth."

In *Monkeybars* and *Kidstuff* Bill Hartley used four talented children in fast-paced sitcom comedic format. Asked whether this is manipulating children and turning them into 'star monsters', Bill Hartley said parents reported that the children were nicer and scholastically better than before they started working. He finds they mix naturally and are friendly with children in the studio audiences they encounter in out of town locations.

Michelle Landsberg, present in the group, recalled that it wasn't a bad scene for her when she was a child star. Hartley recommends not putting children's last names on credits — when he did some of the children received crank calls from adults, that were disturbing to them.

Sarson was asked how he avoided the children mugging for the cameras. He said it took seven minutes to leap that hurdle — they didn't let the children know they were shooting when the kids were fooling around and playing together. When they replayed the tape — although the children complained the'd been cheated! — they came to understand that their natural play was what was wanted. The producers would worry about timing and pacing, would edit later.

Question: Did they get better?
Answer: Not better, more professional. Also, the kind of continuity adults want in a show isn't wanted by children.

October 16, 1975.

SUMMING UP
Dr. Margery King
Executive Director
Canadian Council on Children and Youth

Dr. Margery King observed that there is contrast between the increasing concern manifest today for children's programming and the lack of commitment and poor communication evident three years ago when the CCCY first investigated the field of TV for children.

Programs now are more apontaneous, use children in a more natural way, hosts talk *with* them rather than condescend.

All TV teaches. But is it reaffirming a child's worth or is it putting the child down?

Is too much of it distracting children from valuable relationships with their peers and their parents?

Does TV stretch the imagination? or does it limit it?

Does it stretch experience — expose a child to "possibilities"?

The fantasy-reality dichotomy is false. Elements are there of both. Entertainment can instruct, instruction can entertain. Children shouldn't be used as props in preschool shows and their rights should be fully protected as actors. Quality programming is not necessarily costly. If an energetic, intelligent, sensitive mind is at work. Local stations need to be related closely to their own communities. "It's a privilege to be small, but it's hard to believe!"

SUGGESTIONS FOR CBI

- act as a clearing house for research
- as a rallying point for public opinion, especially parents. Obverse of this is to educate parents to monitor their children's viewing, be with them.
- provide feedback to producers so they aren't dependent on internal research
- continue this type of exchange among broadcast sectors
- promote specialized workshops
- encourage cooperation between stations; sharing

PERSIST and DON'T DESPAIR

le 16 octobre 1975

DISCOURS DE CLOTURE
Dr. Margery King
Directrice exécutive
Conseil Canadien de l'Enfance et de la Jeunesse

Le Dr. King a observé un véritable contrast existant entre l'intérêt croissant manifesté aujourd'hui pour la programmation pour enfants et l'absence d'engagement et de communication qui prévalait, il y a trois ans, alors que la CCEJ étudiait la situation de la télévision pour enfants.

Les emissions sont devenues plus spontanees, on y fait davantage participer les enfants et de façon plus naturelle; les hôtes parlent *avec* eux au lieu de faire preuve, à leur égard, de condescendance.

Toute émission de télévision enseigne. Mais réaffirme-t-elle la valeur de l'enfant ou l'abaisse-telle?

Un visionnement trop important risque-t-il d'éloigner les enfants d'une relation valable avec leurs parents?

La télévision développe-t-elle l'imagination ou la limite-t-elle?

La télévision permet-elle d'étendre l'expérience — en offre-t-elle les possibilités à l'enfant?

La dichotomie fantaisie-réalité est erronée. Les deux éléments doivent être présents. Les émissions de divertissement peuvent instruire, les émissions éducatives peuvent amuser. Les enfants ne devraient pas être utilisés comme piliers des émissions pré-scolaires et leurs droits, en tant qu'acteurs, devraient être entièrement protégés.

Une programmation de qualité n'est pas nécessairement coûteuse . . . si l'on fait preuve, au travail, d'intelligence, d'énergie, de sensibilité. Les stations locales doivent établir d'étroits rapports avec leur communautés respectives.

SUGGESTIONS POUR L'I.R.T.E.

- être le bureau central des recherches
- être le point de ralliement de l'opinion publique, particulièrement de celle des parents. L'observation de ces opinions peut s'avérer utile pour inciter les parents à contrôler le visionnement des enfants et à leur être présents
- fournir des réactions du public (feedback) aux réalisateurs pour qu'ils ne soient pas dépendants de l'unique recherche interne
- poursuivre le type d'échanges entrepris entre les radiodiffuseurs
- promouvoir des colloques et ateliers spécialisés
- encourager la collaboration entre les stations
- persister et ne pas désespérer

October 14, 15, 16, 1975.

RESEARCH MEETINGS
REUNIONS DES RECHERCHISTES

Note: The following is a report on two meetings held during the course of the Workshop among researchers in the field of children's television.

Recommendations and comments from André Caron, and Maurice Gill (research Director, SRC) following the Workshop are also attached.

A deux reprises, au cours du Colloque, les recherchistes ont tenu une réunion dont voici le compte-rendu.

Afin d'avoir une vue d'ensemble des préoccupations des recherchistes, seront aussi exposés, à la suite du compte-rendu, les commentaires, recueillis à la suite du Colloque, d'André Caron (Section Communications, Université de Montréal) et de Maurice Gill (Directeur de la recherche, Société Radio-Canada)

October 14, 1975

WORKSHOP
Patrick Gossage
André Caron

Patrick Gossage
Mr. Gossage indicated that while the main theme of the Workshop was production and programming, the C.B.I. had identified the need to stimulate, initiate, and encourage research since its inception. He stressed that this meeting of those working in the field was to be viewed as a first step toward connecting researchers not only with programmers but also with each other. He anticipated that the discussions would focus on research *in the service* of programming and not simply on effects research. He indicated that the Institute would be receptive to recommendations concerning its own role in the research area.

André Caron
Mr. Caron opened the discussion on current research with a brief account of the origin of the meeting. In July, representatives of the Board of Directors of the C.B.I. met for an intensive study of the research aims and the long term goals of the Institute. At the meeting a need for an exchange of information about Canadian children's programming research was expressed and it was decided that an informal meeting would be held in conjunction with the present workshop for researchers.

Jack Milne
Mr. Milne listed C.B.I. research concerns: a list of researchers is being developed; a study is being done with B.B.M. on viewing habits of children, age 2-11; a list of relevant Canadian research is being assembled; a list of resources in child development is being compiled. Mr. Milne stressed the Institute's willingness to cooperate in sharing and providing ideas and assistance.

October 14, 1975.

WORKSHOP
Joy Mauerhoff
Director, Canadian Communications
Research Information Centre

Ms. Mauerhoff provided a résumé of the information services of the CCRIC and stressed the clearing house function of the Centre which was established as a referral service to collect and disseminate information on communications research activity in Canada. A bi-monthly, bilingual newsletter is distributed without charge. The Centre maintains inventories on (a) human resources-experts and specialists, (b) unpublished documentation. It is anticipated that the activities of the Centre will lead to the growth of a variety of networks of people with common interests.

Janice Nostbakken
Ms. Nostbakken is currently carrying out a general inquiry into *Kidstuff*, a CTV programme aimed at the 8-12 year old audience. The inquiry covers a study of strengths and weaknesses of individual elements to help the programming of continuing episodes. The methodology in brief: there are 84 subjects evenly divided between Toronto and Ottawa representing a typical audience. Techniques being used are (a) in-depth interviews, (b) observational techniques, and (c) questionnaires.

Daniele Brady
(Laboratoire de recherche sur la télévision et l'enfant, Faculté des sciences de l'éducation de l'Université de Montréal). Mlle Brady a présenté un aperçu général du laboratoire. Sous la direction de Gabriel Laroque, le laboratoire a entrepris, depuis 1971-72, une série de travaux de recherche portant sur la relation qui s'établit entre la télévision et l'enfant. Les premières études ont eu pour dessein d'explorer surtout les aspects cognitifs de la relation enfant / télévision. Un second groupe s'est intéressé à l'étude des représentations du *fictif* et de la reconstruction du récit par l'enfant. A la suite des premières recherches, certains membres se sont penchés sur le problème de l'analyse de l'image, sur l'applicabilité de la grande syntagmatique à l'analyse d'un corpus de récits télévisuels pour enfants. Les travaux qui sont maintenant en cours ont pour objet d'interroger les télé spectateurs, enfants ou adolescents, sur leurs représentations des modèles sociaux reproduits dans les émissions télévisuelles. Le laboratoire examine donc la télévision en tant qu'agent de socialisation.

David Nostbakken
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Mr. Nostbakken reported on several studies, one done with C. Bushe, M.R. Maurizi, and A. Zuckernick on children's responses to television programmes. Methodology has included content analysis, observational techniques, and in-depth interviews to produce a psychological study of qualities of program elements that would have appeal to children. Interests include the nature of attention – how do you know?, and what does it mean? Present work is directed toward the nature of imitation and what it means to learning.

Nicole Jacques-Giroux
Section Communications
Université de Montréal

Mlle Jacques-Giroux a cité un projet de recherche *Evaluation d'une émission de télévision pour enfants d'âge préscolaire*: "La Boîte à lettres", Radio-Canada, Montréal. Cette recherche de type 'exploratoire' vise à apporter une contribution à la production d'une émission télévisée de la Société Radio-Canada. La contribution se situera principalement aux niveaux suivants: (a) mesurer l'attention des enfants et analyser leurs réactions face aux différentes séquences des émissions, (b) découvrir les divers éléments de popularité des émissions, et (c) vérifier s'il y a eu apprentissage. Méthodologie: le comportement de chaque groupe sera enregistré sur rubans magnétoscopiques; les réactions de chaque enfant seront transcrites sur une grille d'observation décrivant autant leur comportement verbal que non-verbal; une entrevue du groupe. L'expérimentation aura lieu au cours des prochains mois et les résultats seront probablement disponibles pendant l'été 1976.

André Caron
Mr. Caron reviewed his on-going research on the influence of television on Inuit children's images of themselves and peoples in other lands. The purpose is to evaluate social changes in Eskimo children between the ages of 8 and 13, after exposure to two different series of television programs. Methodology: (a) free elicitation type questionnaire, (b) trial choice method, and (c) a cisual 5 point scale. The project should be completed by the end of the summer of 1976.

André Bouchard
Collège, Jean-de-Bréboeuf
Section Communications

Depuis 1973, une équipe de recherche multi-disciplinaire s'est constituée à l'Université de Montréal en vue d'évaluer scientifiquement l'impact de certaines émissions de télévision éducative sur les enfants de cinq à sept ans. Les émissions retenues furent *Les Oraliens* et *Les Cent Tours de Centour*, deux séries d'émissions, produites par Radio-Québec et diffusées sur les ondes de Radio-Canada. En plus de l'impact, la recherche vise à dégager certains facteurs explicatifs de l'impact, comme par exemple, les facteurs télévisuels, les facteurs linguistiques, les facteurs pédagogiques.

John Liefeld
Consumer Studies, Guelph University

Dr. Liefeld explained that his own interest was in studies of consumer decision-making and information processing. Students in his program had become interested in television advertising and children. Two projects resulted, one on the influence of television advertising on children compared to peer and parental influence, and the other an experimental study structured to assess the effects of television commercials on five year old boys with respect to choice and play with toys and behaviour toward breakfast cereals in supermarket.

Diane England
Section Communications,
Université de Montréal

Mlle England a présenté son projet de recherche *Analyse de l'impact d'une série d'émissions de télévision de Radio-Québec destinée à un auditoire de type 'familial'*. Cette recherche exploratoire tente d'analyser l'impact d'une série télévisée sur un échantillon de personnes représentant l'auditoire auquel elle est destinée. Cette étude devrait pouvoir fournir des données qui permettraient une contribution directe à la production de ces émissions. L'évaluation sera analysée selon trois niveaux: (a) mesurer la rétention des téléspectateurs vis-à-vis les différentes séquences de l'émission, (b) mesurer leur compréhension des séquences, et (c) enfin, évaluer la satisfaction des téléspectateurs vis-à-vis de chacune des émissions.

le 15 octobre, 1975

Report and Comments/Rapport et commentaires

André Caron

Les points suivants ont été discutés lors de deux réunions qui ont suivi la première session d'information pour chercheurs durant les ateliers du 14 au 16 octobre 1975, tenu pour l'Institut de Radio-Télédiffusion pour Enfants.

Pour apprécier ces remarques, il est essentiel de noter qu'il s'agissait d'une première rencontre de chercheurs, intéressés par la télévision et l'enfant, venus se sensibiliser aux activités de l'IRTE.

Les deux points de discussion proposés étaient:

1° Quelles seraient les priorités à établir pour la recherche.

2° Quel rôle l'Institut pourrait jouer en accord avec les efforts de la recherche sur la télévision et l'enfant.

Par rapport à la première question, les points de vues suivants ont été exprimés:

- L'importance accordée au fait que le chercheur se familiarise davantage avec le processus de la production, afin qu'une contribution de sa part soit plus efficace.
- Etant donné la diversité d'intérêt et de spécialisation, certains trouvaient difficile, à ce point, de déterminer au préalable les objectifs et espéraient que l'Institut, à la suite de consultations plus structurées, spécifie davantage ces priorités.
- Cette consultation devrait tenir compte des besoins exprimés par les réalisateurs et des intérêts des chercheurs.
- L'importance d'établir un climat sain d'échange entre réalisateurs et chercheurs, réellement intéressés à échanger dès les premières étapes de la conceptualisation des émissions.
- Certains ont exprimé des doutes sur la validité de la recherche "non-influencée" dans le contexte des présentes structures et institutions.
- On a alors suggéré que, possiblement, la seule alternative était de fonctionner à l'extérieur de ces cadres, en assurant une dissémination de l'information par des canaux "non officiels" au niveau des groupes communautaires.
- La recherche doit tenir compte non seulement de la programmation pour enfant mais surtout des émissions en général auxquelles les enfants sont exposés. Une étude de la programmation devra tenir compte à la fois des émissions produites localement et de celles de sources extérieures.
- On a réitéré le fait que très peu de recherche existe sur ce medium vieux de 25 ans et que seul un effort d'envergure, échelonné sur plusieurs années, pourrait commencer à combler ce vide. Cette intervention avait pour but de prévenir les gens concernés qu'un nombre limités de recherches ne pourraient avoir que très peu d'influence.
- Etant donné que la télévision pour enfants comporte une certaine idéologie, la recherche pourrait encourager les réalisateurs à soutenir ou à ajuster celle qu'ils véhiculent dans leur émissions.
- Il est primordial que la recherche puisse s'adresser et rejoindre les parents.

Enfin, on en est venu à un certain consensus selon lequel une des démarches les plus importantes serait de réaliser, au niveau local, une analyse critique des émissions auxquelles les enfants sont exposés, afin de vérifier les éléments dont elles sont composées.

En ce qui a trait au rôle de l'IRTE voici ce qu'on a exprimé:

- Il est impératif que les groupes qui devraient être majoritairement concernés (les parents, etc.) soient impliqués à tous les niveaux de l'Institut.
- Sans nier l'importance de la contribution des institutions présentes, on considère que, si l'on veut réellement améliorer la télévision pour enfants, il faut que la famille soit impliquée et que tous les groupes participent et collaborent à cette fin.
- L'Institut peut, entre autres, assurer un échange d'information entre chercheurs, entre chercheurs et réalisateurs, entre chercheurs, réalisateurs et parents.

Un tel organisme (IRTE) devrait être constamment soucieux de conserver impartialité et objectivité s'il veut supporter, encourager et commanditer les efforts de recherche qui veulent atteindre les objectifs que l'Institut se sera fixé.

On souhaiterait que l'Institut puisse devenir un carrefour permettant des rencontres entre groupes d'intérêts divers et où leurs membres pourraient dialoguer et travailler à une cause commune: l'amélioration de la programmation pour enfants.

SUGGESTIONS

Maurice Gill
Directeur du Service de la Recherche
Société Radio-Canada

Commentaires et suggestions.
Dans une optique de recherche:

- Trouver un moyen d'impliquer les parents dans la recherche de priorités et d'objectifs en ce qui a trait à la télévision et l'enfant.
- Organiser des rencontres avec des groupes de citoyens, des groupes de pression; faire de l'animation sociale auprès du public afin de les informer; amener les réalisateurs à collaborer à une telle entreprise (tenant compte du fait qu'ils doivent participer à la définition d'objectifs). A qui incombe la tâche d'une telle organisation?
- Quels sont les besoins du public canadien, des réalisateurs, des radiodiffuseurs, etc..., en terme de recherche, au niveau de la télévision et l'enfant (en regard des critères de production et de rentabilité)?
- Une des démarches possibles de la recherche pourrait être la suivante:
  - informer les parents, les impliquer
  - analyse des émissions
  - établir certains schéma, certains critères quant à la qualité et au contenu des émissions, en regard des besoins des enfants.
- Evaluation critique des émissions produites et clarification des objectifs à atteindre pour les émissions à produire.
- Une nouvelle session d'information, organisée par l'I.R.T.E., serait souhaitable afin de clarifier le fonctionnement, le mandat, les objectifs de l'Institut.
- Le CRTC, en tant qu'organisme de médiation, devrait se pencher attentivement sur la question de la télévision et l'enfant et proposer des objectifs, définir des problèmes valables et prioritaires pour stimuler les recherches.
- La grande question qu'il reste à régler est de savoir s'il est possible d'impliquer davantage les parents, les radiodiffuseurs et les chercheurs dans la définition des problèmes que pose la télévision pour enfants et de déterminer qui devrait prendre en charge ce projet.

APPENDIX / ANNEXE

AGENDA – ORDRE DU JOUR

CHILDREN'S PROGRAM WORKSHOP – Workshop Committee
COLLOQUE SUR LA PROGRAMMATION POUR ENFANTS – Comité du Colloque

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CHILDREN'S BROADCAST INSTITUTE
COMITE DES DIRECTEURS DE L'INSTITUT DE RADIO-TELEDIFFUSION POUR ENFANTS

CBI CHILDREN'S WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
PARTICIPANTS AU COLLOQUE DE L'I.R.T.E.

LIST OF SPONSORS
LISTE DES COMMENDITAIRES

VISIONNEMENT / SCREENING – List of Programs
– Liste des émissions

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE
RESUME DES REPONSES AU QUESTIONNAIRE SUR LE COLLOQUE

EXPOSE SUR LA TELEVISION EN DIRECT – James Dormeyer (Radio-Canada)

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

DAY 1 – OCTOBER 14

Noon–6:00 p.m.	Registration
2:00–6:00	Screening – ROBERT ROY
3:30–5:30	Meeting of Researchers – ANDRE CARON
6:00–7:30	Reception
7:30–Concl.	Banquet
	Chairman of Workshop – NAN-B DE GASPE BEAUBIEN
	Welcome & Introduction of Head Table
	Introduction of Guest Speaker
	GUEST SPEAKER – HARRY BOYLE

DAY 2 – OCTOBER 15 THEME: "REALITY OR FANTASY?"

8:00–9:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:30–9:35	Opening Remarks
	Screening Chairman – ROBERT ROY
9:35–11:00	Screening
11:00–11:15	Coffee Break
11:15–12:30 p.m.	Panel & Discussion
	Panel Chairman – ARTHUR WEINTHAL
	Panelists – MICHEL CAILLOUX
	BILL HARTLEY
	ROBERT LIEBERT
	SAM RABINOVITCH
12:30–2:00	LUNCHEON
	Chairman – PATRICK GOSSAGE
	SPEAKER – DR. SAM RABINOVITCH
2:00–4:30	WORKSHOPS:
	1. BUILDING FROM NOTHING – RITA DEVERELL, JANIS DUNNING
	2. WORKING WITH CHILDREN – CHRIS SARSON, BILL HARTLEY
	3. WHO IS WATCHING AND WHY? – ROBERT LIEBERT, DAVID ADAMS
	4. FANTASY OR REALITY? – DR. SAM RABINOVITCH
4:30–4:45	Coffee Break
4:45–5:30	THIS IS LIVE!
	Chairman – ROBERT ROY
	JAMES DORMEYER – TELECHROME
5:30–6:30	Break
6:30–8:15	DINNER
	Chairman – ARTHUR WEINTHAL
	SPEAKER – BOB KEESHAN
8:15–11:00	Screening

DAY 3 – OCTOBER 16 THEME: "WHAT MAKES A GOOD PROGRAM GOOD?"

8:00–9:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:30–9:35	Opening Remarks Screening Chairman – ROBERT ROY
9:35–11:00	Screening
11:00–11:15	Coffee Break
11:15–12:30 p.m.	Panel & Discussion Panel Chairman – JOHN KENNEDY Panelists – MICHELE LANDSBERG CHRIS SARSON JEAN-PAUL LADOUCEUR
12:30–2:00	LUNCHEON Chairman – MADELEINE SAINT-JACQUES SPEAKER – ROD CONEYBEARE
2:00–4:30	WORKSHOPS 1. BUILDING FROM NOTHING – RITA DEVERELL, JANIS DUNNING 2. WORKING WITH CHILDREN – CHRIS SARSON, BILL HARTLEY 3. WHO IS WATCHING AND WHY? – ROBERT LIEBERT, DAVID ADAMS 4. WHAT MAKES A GOOD PROGRAM GOOD? – BOB KEESHAN, MAURICE FALARDEAU
4:30–5:30	Plenary Session Chairman – NAN-B. DE GASPE BEAUBIEN Summing Up DR. MARGERY KING

ANNEXE I

ORDRE DU JOUR
1er JOUR – 14 OCTOBRE

MIDI–18h00	Inscription
14h00–18h00	Visionnement – ROBERT ROY
15h30–17h30	Réunion des recherchistes – ANDRE CARON
18h00–19h30	Réception
19h30	Banquet Présidente du colloque – NAN-B. DE GASPE BEAUBIEN Accueil et présentation de la table d'honneur Présentation du conférencier d'honneur CONFERENCIER D'HONNEUR – HARRY BOYLE

2ième JOUR – 15 OCTOBRE **THEME: "REALITE OU FANTAISIE?"**

08h00–09h00	Petit déjeuner
09h30–09h35	Introduction Président du Visionnement – ROBERT ROY
09h35–11h00	Visionnement
11h00–11h15	Pause-café
11h15–12h30	Groupe de discussion Président du Groupe – ARTHUR WEINTHAL Membres – MICHEL CAILLOUX BILL HARTLEY ROBERT LIEBERT SAM RABINOVITCH
12h30–14h00	DEJEUNER Président – PATRICK GOSSAGE Conférencier – Dr SAM RABINOVITCH
14h00–16h30	ATELIERS: 1. A PARTIR DE RIEN – RITA DEVERELL, JANIS DUNNING 2. TRAVAILLER AVEC LES ENFANTS – CHRIS SARSON, BILL HARTLEY 3. QUI REGARDE QUOI ET POURQUOI? – ROBERT LIEBERT, BILL HARTLEY 4. REALITE OU FANTAISIE? – Dr SAM RABINOVITCH
16h30–16h45	Pause-café
16h45–17h30	EN DIRECT Président – ROBERT ROY JAMES DORMEYER – TELECHROME
17h30–18h30	Temps Libre
18h30–20h15	DINER Président – ARTHUR WEINTHAL Conférencier – BOB KEESHAN
20h15–23h00	Visionnement

3ième JOUR – 16 OCTOBRE **THEME: "QU'EST-CE QU'UNE BONNE EMISSION?"**

08h00–09h00	Petit déjeuner
09h30–09h35	Introduction Président du Visionnement – ROBERT ROY
09h35–11h00	Visionnement
11h00–11h15	Pause-café
11h15–12h30	Groupe de discussion Président du groupe – ARTHUR WEINTHAL Membres – JOHN KENNEDY MICHELE LANDSBERG CHRIS SARSON JEAN PAUL LADOUCEUR
?éh30–14h00	DEJEUNER Présidente – MADELEINE SAINT-JACQUES Conférencier – ROD CONEYBEARE

14h00–16h30	ATELIERS: 1. A PARTIR DE RIEN – RITA DEVERELL, JANIS DUNNING 2. TRAVAILLER AVEC LES ENFANTS – CHRIS SARSON, BILL HARTLEY 3. QUI REGARDE QUOI ET POURQUOI? – ROBERT LIEBERT, DAVID ADAMS 4. QU'EST-CE QU'UNE BONNE EMISSION? – BOB KEESHAN, MAURICE FALARDEAU
16h30–17h30	Séance Plénière Présidente – NAN-B. DE GASPE BEAUBIEN Résumé DR MARGERY KING

APPENDIX II

CHILDREN'S PROGRAM WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP COMMITTEE

Workshop Chairman	NAN-B DE GASPE BEAUBIEN
Screening Chairman	ROBERT ROY
Panel Chairman	ARTHUR WEINTHAL
Chairman of Afternoon Workshops	DR. MARGERY KING
Budget Chairman	J.N. MILNE
Press Liaison	RICHARD BERTRAND
Executive Secretary	JOAN SOLOVIOR
Workshop Liaison	GAYLE JABOUR

ANNEXE II

COLLOQUE-ATELIER
PROGRAMMATION POUR ENFANTS

COMITE DE DIRECTION

Présidente du Colloque	NAN-B DE GASPE BEAUBIEN
Président du Visionnement	ROBERT ROY
Président, Groupes de Discussion	ARTHUR WEINTHAL
Président, Ateliers de l'après-midi	DR. MARGERY KING
Président du Budget	J.N. MILNE
Liaison avec la presse	RICHARD BERTRAND
Secrétaire exécutive	JOAN SOLOVIOR
Liaison pour le Colloque	GAYLE JABOUR

APPENDIX III

Board of Directors of
THE CHILDREN'S BROADCAST INSTITUTE

RICHARD BERTRAND, Canadian Cable Television Association
TOM BLAKELY, Association of Canadian Advertisers, Inc.
BOYD BROWNE, Mattel Canada Ltd.
MURRAY CHERCOVER, CTV Television Network Ltd.
NAN-B DE GASPE BEAUBIEN, Director-at-large
PIERRE GERVAIS, Bell Canada, Montreal
PATRICK GOSSAGE, Canadian Radio-Television Commission
MARGERY KING, Canadian Council on Children and Youth
JEAN-PAUL LADOUCEUR, TvA
DES. MCCALMONT, Religious Television Associates
J.N. MILNE* Institute of Canadian Advertising
L.L. MOORE, Television Bureau of Canada
ROBERT E. OLIVER, Director-at-large
A.Z. PENGELLY, Canadian Advertising Advisory Board
F.B. RAINSBERRY, Director-at-large
ROBERT ROY, Director-at-large
JACK RUTTLE, Canadian Association of Broadcasters
MADELEINE SAINT-JACQUES, Young & Rubicam Ltd., Montreal
JOHN TWOMEY, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Rdio & TV Arts
A.T. VERNON, Canadian Toy Manufacturer's Association
JOYCE WATKINS, Canadian Broadcasting League
ARTHUR WEINTHAL, CTV Television Network Ltd.

ANNEXE III

Le bureau d'administration
L'INSTITUT DE RADIO-TELEDIFFUSION POUR ENFANTS
est composé de:

RICHARD BERTRAND, Association Canadienne de Télévision par Câble
TOM BLAKELY, Association Canadienne des Annonceurs incorporée
BOYD BROWNE* Mattel Canada Ltd.
MURRAY CHERCOVER, CTV Television Network Ltd.
NAN-B DE GASPE BEAUBIEN, à titre personnel
PIERRE GERVAIS, Bell Canada, Montréal
PATRICK GOSSAGE, Conseil de la Radio-Télévision Canadienne
MARGERY KING, Conseil Canadien de l'Enfance et de la Jeunesse
JEAN-PAUL LADOUCEUR, le réseau de télévision TvA
DES MCCALMONT, Religious Television Associates
J.N. MILNE, Institut de la Publicité Canadienne
L.L. MOORE, Bureau de Télévision du Canada

ROBERT E. OLIVER, à titre personnel
A.Z. PENGELLY, Bureau Consultatif de la Publicité au Canada
F.B. RAINSBERRY, à titre personnel
ROBERT ROY, à titre personnel
JACK RUTTLE, Association Canadienne des Radiodiffuseurs
MADELEINE SAINT-JACQUES, Young & Rubicam Ltd., Montréal
JOHN TWOMEY, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Radio & TV Arts
A.T. VERNON, Association des Manufacturiers Canadiens de Jouets
JOYCE WATKINS, Ligue de la Radiodiffusion Canadienne
ARTHUR WEINTHAL, CTV Television Network Ltd.

APPENDIX IV – ANNEXE IV

CBI CHILDREN'S WORKSHOP
Colloque – atelier sur la programmation pour enfants – IRTE

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ASSOCIATION
ACTON, Gerry	CAB
ADAMS, David	BBM Bureau of Measurement
ADILMAN, Sid	Toronto Star
ARMSTRONG, Jim	CKY
ARMSTRONG, J.P.	CFPL-TV
BALCON, David	CRTC
BARIL, Michèle	CRTC
BARON, Lois	John Abbott College
BASSIN, Annabel	Ryerson
BERTRAND, Rick	Canadian Cable Television Ass.
BEST, Norman	Ontario Dept. of Education
BLAKELY, Tom	ACA
BOUCHARD, André	Université de Montréal
BOURASSA-LAMBERT, Carmen	Ministère de l'Education, Québec
BOURQUE, Raymond	CFCM-TV-Québec
BRADY, Danielle	Université de Montréal
BRAMM, Jack	Spitzer Mills & Bates
BROUSSEAU, Jean	CKTM-TV
CAILLOUX, Michel	Société Radio-Canada
CASEY, Maureen	SOS
CENNON, Jack	CKBI
CLARK, Chris	CBC, Toronto
CARON, André	Université de Montréal
COUGHLAN, Danny	Stratford Children's PRDNS-CKCO
CURRIE, Vern	Darmouth Cable
DE GASPE BEAUBIEN, Nan-B	CBI
DEVERELL, Rita	Religious Television Associates
DOMPIERRE, Louise	Canada Council
DONOVAN, Richard	CBC

NAME	ASSOCIATION
DORMEYER, James	Société Radio-Canada
DUNNING, Janis	CKY
ELLIOTT, Bill	BCTV Vancouver
ENGLAND, Diane	Université de Montréal
FALARDEAU, Maurice	Société Radio-Canada
FLATMAN, Barry	Home Made Theatre
FLECK, M.	Ministry of Education, Ontario
FORSYTH, Don	CFCF
GIFFORD, Tony	OECA
GILL, Maurice	Société Radio-Canada
GIROUX, Nicole	Université de Montréal
GOSSAGE, Patrick	CRTC
GREGOR, Tom	Humber College
GREGORET, Michèle	CBXFT-Edmonton
HARTLEY, Bill	CTV
HARVEY, Derrick	Community Antenna
HEARN, Emily	Writer
HOMME, R.M.	CBC
JABOUR, Gayle	CRTC
JASECHKO, Elena	CFTO-TV
KENNEDY, John	CBC
KIS, Janet	Frog Print Theatre
KRAVJANSKY, Mik	Black Box Theatre
KRENZLER, L.R.	*It is Written* Telecast
KRONBY, Madeline	CBC Freelance Writer
KUPLOWSKY, Olga	OECA
LABUSSIONIERE, Diane	Secrêtariat d'Etat
LADOUCEUR, Jean-Paul	CFTM (TVA)
LANDSBERG, Michele	Chatelaine
LEMAY, Lise	Radio-Québec
LESSONINI, Guy	TV Hebdo
LIEBERT, Robert Dr.	State University of New York
LIEFELD, John	University of Guelph
LIPTROTT, Peggy	Presbyterian Church of Canada
LITTLE, Fred	Child Entertainer
LOVE, M.J.	Bell Canada
MACKAY, Jed	Writer
MANNING-ALBERT, Jacqui	Parks & Recreation
MARCUS, Susan	CBC
MATTENLEY, J.	CKVR-TV
MATTHEWS, Bryn	CJOH-TV
MAUERHOFF, Joy	Canadian Communications
MEAGHER, Elaine	Department of Communications
MEAR-CRIME, Annie	Université de Montréal
MILNE, J.N.	I.C.A.
MILLER, Romany	CJOH-TV
MIRABELLI, Allan	Vanier Institute
MOLLIN, Larry	Home Made Theatre
MORIN, Claude	Société Radio-Canada
MRVICA, Ann	Ryerson RTA

NAME	ASSOCIATION
NELSON, D.C.	CBC
NOSTBAKKEN, David	OISE
NOSTBAKKEN, Janis	CTV
O'BRYAN, Kenneth	OECA
O'CONNELL, Kevin	CBNT-TV St-John's
O'LEARY, Brian	CBOT-TV
OLIVER, Robert	CAAB Toronto
O'NEIL, Patricia	Ryerson
PECKFORD, Ruby	Cross Road Telecast
PESANT, Raymond	Société Radio-Canada
POLEQUIN, Louise	Ministère de l'Education
POST, Shirley	Consumer's Ass. Canada
POWER, John	CBNT-TV
QUINN, Robin	CAB
RABINOVITCH, Dr. S.	McGill University
REINBLATT, Gary	McDonald's
REMILLARD, Jean	Radio-Québec
PATRICK-ROBERTS, Marnie	Ryerson's College
ROBERTSON, G.	CKVR-TV
ROCHON, Gerard	CFTO
ROGERS, Harvey	Scarborough Cable
ROONEY, Ted	Stratford Children's PRDNS -- CKCO-TV
ROSENBERG, Barry	Spitzer, Mills & Bates
ROY, Robert	Société Radio Canada
RUBES, Susan	Young People's Theatre
RUTTLE, Jack	CJOH-TV
SAINT-JACQUES, M.	Young & Rubicam
ST-ONGE, Roland	OTEO
SACKVILLE, Cathie	CKCO-TV
SARSON, Chris	Freelance TV Prod.
SAVATH, Phil	Home Made Theatre
SIMONS, Joy	CBC
SOMMERS, J.	CFPL-TV
STEWART, W.A.	Global TV
SOLBERG, Janet	CRTC
SOLOVIOV, Joan	CBI
VANDERHEYDEN, Kees	Radio-Québec
VERNON, Ruth	OECA
VIDAL, Pierre	Ontario Min. Transportation and Communications
WATKINS, Joyce	CBL Ottawa
WEBB, Rod	CKY
WEINTHAL, Arthur	CTV
WEINSBORD, Hyman	CRTC
WILLCOX, Don	CKCO-TV
YOUNG, Noreen	CBOT
ZUCKERNICK, Arlene	OECA

APPENDIX V

LIST OF SPONSORS

Opening Night Reception and Banquet:
MCDONALD'S RESTAURANTS OF CANADA
Luncheon – October 15:
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS
Dinner – October 15:
CJOH-TV
Luncheon – October 16:
KELLOGG'S OF CANADA
Coffee Breaks:
courtesy GENERAL GOODS LTD.
Simultaneous Translations:
grant from the SECRETARY OF STATE
Staff and Technical Assistance provided by:
CTV NETWORK
ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN ADVERTISERS
YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION
Press Folders:
courtesy YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
Invitations with the assistance of:
WARNER LAMBERT LTD.
ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN ADVERTISERS INC.
YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
Press Facility:
courtesy CANADIAN CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION
Workshop programmes printed courtesy
CHAMPLAIN PRODUCTIONS LIMITED

ANNEXE V

LISTE DES COMMANDITAIRES

Réception et Banquet d'Ouverture:
RESTAURANTS MCDONALD DU CANADA
Déjeuner, 15 octobre:
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES RADIODIFFUSEURS
Dîner, 15 octobre:
CJOH-TV
Déjeuner, 16 octobre:
KELLOGG CANADA
Pauses-café:
gracieuseté de GENERAL FOODS LTEE.

Traductions simultanées:
octroi du SECRETARIAT D'ETAT
Personnel et techniciens auxiliares fournis par:
CTV TELEVISION NETWORK LTD.
ASSOCIATION DES ANNONCEURS CANADIENS
YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
CONSEIL DE LA RADIO-TELEVISION CANADIENNE
Pochettes – documentation pour la presse:
gracieuseté de YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
Invitations avec le concours de:
WARNER-LAMBERT LTD.
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES ANNONCEURS INC.
YOUNG & RUBICAM LTD.
Installations pour la presse:
gracieuseté de l'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE TELEVISION PAR CABLE
Impression des programmes gracieuseté de
CHAMPLAIN PRODUCTIONS LIMITED

APPENDIX VI – ANNEXE VI

VISIONNEMENT – SCREENING
MERCREDI 15 OCTOBRE / WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 15
9:35 – 11:00
ZACHARIAH GIBSONS MAGIC TRUNK NO. 1 (OECA) 15 MIN.
COMING UP ROSIE NO. 2 (CBC) 30 MIN.
AU JARDIN DE PIERROT NO. 3 (SRC) 15 MIN.
THE WATERVILLE GANG NO. 4 (CTV-CFTO) 30 MIN.
ALLO GRENOUILLE NO. 5 (SRC) 30 MIN.
TOM AND FRIENDS NO. 6 (CHAT)
BOBINO NO. 7 (SRC) 30 MIN.
POLKA DOT DOOR NO. 8 (OECA) 30 MIN.
STORYTIME NO. 9 (CKPG-TV) 30 MIN.
LE GRENIER NO. 10 (SRC) 30 MIN.
THE SUNFLOWER ADVENTURE NO. 11 (OECA) 10 MIN.
A STATIONARY ARK NO. 12 (CBC) 30 MIN.
LETS GO NO. 13 (MTV-CKY) 30 MIN.
LES 100 TOURS DE CENTOUR NO. 13A (ORTQ) 15 MIN.
CHINA: SOMETHING ELSE (CBC) 30 MIN.

VISIONNEMENT – SCREENING
JEUDI 16 OCTOBRE / THURSDAY OCTOBER 16
9:35 – 11:00
FANTASTICA
KIDSTUFF NO. 14 (CTV) 60 MIN.
ALLIGATOR PIE NO. 15 (CBC) 30 MIN.
LES PETITS AMIS NO. 16 (CHLT)

THE MAGIC TRUMPET NO. 17 (MTV-CKY) 60 MIN.
THE UNCLE BOBBY SHOW NO. 18 (CFTO) 30 MIN.
NIC'N PIC NO. 19 (SRC) 30 MIN.
THE TREE HOUSE NO. 20 (CKCO-TV)
LES BOUTS D'CHOU NO. 21 (CFTM) 30 MIN.
FUNTOWN NO. 22 (MTV-CKY) 60 MIN.
YOU HOU NO. 23 (SRC) 15 MIN.
PENCIL BOX NO. 24 (CBC) 30 MIN.
CUCUMBER NO. 25 (OECA) 30 MIN.
LES ORALIENS NO. 26 (ORTQ) 15 MIN.
CIRCLE SQUARE NO. 28 (CROSSROADS TELECAST) 30 MIN.
ALMIGHTY VOICE (OECA)
THE SUN RUNNERS (OECA)
L'ATELIER DES PISSENLITS (OTEO)

VISONNEMENT / SCREENING
MARDI 14 OCTOBRE / TUESDAY OCTOBER 14
14:00 – 18:00
14:00 – WATERVILLE GANG NO. 4 (CFTO)
14:30 – ALLIGATOR PIE NO. 15 (CBC)
15:00 – YOU HOU NO. 23 (SRC)
15:45 – KIDSTUFF NO. 14 (CTV)
16:45 – ZACHARIAH GIBSON'S MAGIC TRUNK NO. 1 (OECA)
17:00 – TREE HOUSE (STRATFORD CHILDREN PROD) NO. 20
17:30 – THE MAGIC TRUMPET (MTV-CKY) NO. 17

APPENDIX VII

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

Number who participated in Workshop – 134
Number of questionnaires returned – 40

This is just under 1 / 3 (30%); 8 in french; over half (25) from the broadcast sector; 5 from research; 3 from government; 2 creative (free-lance); 2 students; 1 advertising agency; 1 from industry (Bell).

Q. 1. Do you feel an annual meeting like the Workshop is beneficial to your organization and / or to you personally?

Unanimously favourable response. Nearly everyone wanted more conferences. Suggestions ranged from annual or bi-annual conference (depending on financing) to regional conferences, conferences for special interest groups in various locations.

The majority feeling seemed to be that the next conference should have a more specific focus and include input from advertisers, parents, European programming and possibly from children themselves (possibly on a write-in basis from classrooms).

The organizers were congratulated on an excellent initiative and exhorted to keep up the good work which encourages an active and personal commitment, strengthens and stimulates one to continue working for better children's programming. The potential for making a real contribution is there.

Q. 2. What did you find most interesting and / or rewarding?

The two most frequent benefits cited were (a) opportunity for exchange and personal interaction and, (b) the "cross-fertilizing" value of the variety of interests represented.

General – registration and orientation should begin in the morning. Screening list should be available at time of registration. Also, bibliography of participants' work and relevant studies should be prepared beforehand.

Screening – most people did not like the excerpting, they found it frustrating and misleading. It was suggested that there should be more selectivity (either on basis of merit or for balanced representation or at least showing "meat" of a program if not its entirety).

Screening might be incorporated into panels and workshops. Panelists could discuss, analyze, interpret, evaluate a screened program with the creative and production people involved. Smaller workshop groups (some of people in the same field, i.e. small or low budget producers) could do the same things. This appraoch would be more oriented to "problem-solving", concerned with the objectives, with program values, reaction and interaction with the audience, practicalities of production and offering 'expert' opinion. In general, more time for small informal discussion groups and provision for later screenings and repeats as requested.

Workshops – terrific! Possibly each workshop session could be shorter, two per day, to allow participants to get to them all. They promote dialogue; sharing and comparison of technique; give perspective on differences between large and small, French and English difficulties as well as pointing up similarities; information on new projects; in-depth exchanges and participation.

Translation services should be extended to these workshops.

Research – latest analyses and statistics should be made available; new techniques should be described and demonstrated; experts should respond to specific problems posed by participants; academic views on programming should be offered.

Qs. 3 & 4. Do you have any specific suggestions that might be incorporated in future workshops? Other comments.

More specific questions, i.e. needs of children, media distribution, identity and cultural messages, should be discussed.

Policy of CBI should be clarified: (a) concern in all programs shown before 8 pm which children may watch; (b) as vocal advocate for responsible television, providing action and leadership.

Follow-up – what about a television channel for children exclusively, like a magazine, a nourishing mix of programming?

There should be a periodic newsletter detailing activities of participants, promoting on-going communication with peers.

Conclusion – exchange and learning took place in an atmosphere of mutual encouragement and interaction with people of goodwill and similar interests. Insights gained into one another's aspirations and goals as well as problems is valuable. Gave a perspective on all aspects of programming and distribution.

The next conference should be more practical, more critical, more analytic, more particular. This time a lot of questions were posed – next time perhaps we can come up with some answers.

What emerges is a genuine concern for the welfare of the child viewer – how best to improve his bill of fare is a continuing challenge to everyone who came to Ottawa for those two and a half days in October.

THE CHILDREN'S BROADCAST INSTITUTE
L'INSTITUT DE RADIO-TELEDIFFUSION POUR ENFANTS

QUESTIONNAIRE

We would appreciate your comments about the Workshop. Nous aimerions recevoir vos commentaires, à la fin du Colloque.

1. Do you feel an annual meeting like the Workshop is beneficial to your organization and/or to you personally?

   Croyez-vous qu'une rencontre annuelle comme celle-ci soit profitable pour l'organisme que vous representez ou pour vous personnellement?

2. What did you find most interesting and/or rewarding?

   Qu'avez-vous trouvé le plus intéressant ou le plus enrichissant?

3. Do you have any specific suggestions that might be incorporated in future workshops?

   Avez-vous des suggestions à formuler?

4. Other comments. Autres commentaires.

Name/Nom .....

ANNEXE VII

Résumé des réponses au questionnaire sur le Colloque

Nombre de participants au Colloque: 134
Nombre de questionnaires retournés: 40

Cet échantillonnage se situe juste au-dessous du 1/3 (30%) et est réparti comme suit: 8 en français; plus de la moitié (25) provient du domaine de la radiodiffusion; 5 de la recherche; 3 du gouvernement, 2 de pigistes; 2 d'étudiants; 1 d'une agence de publicité et 1 de l'industrie (Bell).

Q. 1. Croyez-vous qu'une rencontre annuelle comme celle-ci soit profitable pour l'organisme que vous représentez et/ou pour vous personnellement?

A l'unanimité, les réponses sont favorables. Presque tout le monde désire des conférences en plus grand nombre. Les suggestions portaient sur des conférences annuelles ou bi-annuelles (dépendant de l'état des budgets), des conférences régionales, des conférences pour des groupes spéciaux d'intérêts dans diverses régions.

Le sentiment de la majorité semble être qu'une prochaine conférence devrait porter sur un thème plus spécifique et devrait comprendre les opinions et commentaires des annonceurs, des parents, des informations sur la programmation européenne, de même que les idées des enfants eux-mêmes, si possible (en se basant sur une rédaction faite en classe, par exemple).

On a félicité les organisateurs de cette initiative et on les a exhorté à continuer cet excellent travail qui encourage l'engagement personnel, renforce et stimule la volonté des gens à travailler pour améliorer la programmation pour enfants.

Q. 2. Qu'avez-vous trouvé le plus intéressant ou le plus enrichissant?

Les deux avantages les plus souvent cités furent (a) l'occasion d'échanges et d'interaction personnelle et (b) le partage de valeurs venant de la diversité des intérêts représentés.

Généralités – l'inscription devrait se faire le matin. La liste des émissions à visionner devrait être disponible au moment de l'inscription. De plus, une bibliographie des travaux des participants et des études importantes devraient être préparée à l'avance.

Visionnement – la plupart des participants ont déploré qu'on ne leur présente que des extraits d'émissions; ils ont trouvé l'expérience frustrante et fallacieuse. On a suggéré une sélection plus importante (en vertu de la valeur des émissions ou afin d'avoir une représentation plus équilibrée ou afin de présenter le "jus" d'une émission si celle-ci ne peut être présenter entièrement).

Le visionnement devrait être présenté durant les tables rondes et les ateliers. Les panelistes pourraient discuter, analyser, interpréter, évaluer les émissions qu'ils visionnent avec les réalisateurs, comédiens, ou autres personnes impliquées. De plus petits groupes (de gens oeuvrant dans la même discipline, i.e. producteurs ou réalisateurs ayant des budgets restreints) pourraient se former en atelier et participer aux mêmes activités. Cette approche serait orientée davantage sur la solution des problèmes, permettrait une conscience accrue des buts, de la valeur des émissions, des réactions et interactions avec l'auditoire, des techniques et aspects pratiques de la production ainsi que de l'opinion des "experts". En général, on voudrait que soit accordé plus de temps

à la formation de petits groupes de discussion informelle et on recommande de prévoir le matériel nécessaire aux reprises et visionnements ultérieurs.

Ateliers: Formidable! On a cependant suggéré que les ateliers soient de plus courte durée, à raison de deux par jour, afin de permettre aux participants d'assister toutes les activités. Ils permettent de dialoguer, de partager et de comparer les techniques; ils donnent un aperçu des différences existant entre les grandes et petites communautés, des difficultés auxquels font face les communautés francophones et anglophones tout en en indiquant les similitudes; les ateliers dispensent, de plus, l'information sur les nouveaux projets et favorisent les échanges en profondeur et la participation.

On devrait étendre les services de traduction simultanée aux ateliers.

Recherche – les plus récentes analyses et statistiques en ce domaine devraient être disponibles; les nouvelles techniques devraient faire l'objet d'une description et d'une démonstration; les experts devraient répondre aux questions spécifiques des participants; les points de vues académiques sur la programmation devraient être verbalisés.

Qs 3 et 4. En vue de prochains colloques, avez-vous des suggestions spécifiques à formuler?

On devrait discuter davantage de questions plus spécifiques, telles les besoins des enfants, la distribution que font les media des émissions pour enfants, l'identité et les messages culturels.

La politique de l'I.R.T.E. devrait être clarifiée: (a) inquiétude concernant les émissions diffusées avant 20 heures que les enfants pourraient regarder; (b) en tant que groupe de pression et guide pour l'action d'une télévision responsable.

Suites: peut-être un canal de télévision exclusivement pour les enfants, de type magazine, à la programmation substantielle?

Un bulletin périodique devrait fre émis, couvrant les détails des activités des participants, continuant ainsi la communication déjà établie.

Conclusion – l'apprentissage et les échanges ont eu lieu dans une ambiance d'encouragements mutuels et d'interaction avec des gens ayant des intérêts similaires. Les perceptions, les buts et les aspirations de chacun ont pu être beaucoup mieux compris. Le colloque a permis d'étendre les connaissances en matière de programmation et de distribution.

La prochaine conférence devrait être plus pratique, plus critique, plus analytique et plus détaillée. Au cours du colloque, plusieurs questions ont été soulevées – peut-être pourrons-nous, la prochaine fois, y apporter quelques réponses.

Ce qui ressort de ce Colloque est un véritable souci de la protection de l'enfant téléspectateur – l'amélioration de son "régime" de visionnement est un défi continuel pour tous ceux qui sont venus à Ottawa passer deux jours et demi en octobre dernier.

ANNEXE VIII

EXPOSE SUR LA TELEVISION EN DIRECT

Extraits de l'exposé de James Dormeyer, lors du Colloque de l'Institut de Radio-Télédiffusion pour Enfants.

OTTAWA – 14, 15, 16 OCTOBRE 1975

Les premiers réalisateurs de télévision eurent pour point de référence le cinéma et, dans une certaine mesure, ils réclamèrent la mise au point du ruban

magnétoscopique. Celui-ci permet, tout comme la pellicule, d'emmagasiner des images susceptibles d'être ensuite organisées et montées, en vue d'un spectacle dont la syntaxe est fort semblable à celle du film.

C'est alors qu'interviennent certains facteurs de rentabilité: il faut du temps pour fabriquer une image, quelle qu'elle soit. Mais, alors qu'un réalisateur de film peut passer deux mois à tourner un long métrage d'une heure trente, un réalisateur de télévision ne dispose, pour une oeuvre de même durée, que de deux semaines.

En voilà lù l'on commence à percevoir les origines du malise que ressentent bon nombre de réalisateurs de télévision.

La grille de programme est un énorme gouffre à images, pour un petit pays comme le Canada, qui doit assumer 70% de son contenu et il faut la remplir dans des délais de fabrication peu compatibles avec la recherche et la réflexion. Au cours d'une semaine consacrée entièrement aux lectures de texte, aux répétitions, aux enregistrements et aux montages magnétoscopiques, il est difficile,difficile, pour le réalisateur, de penser à un projet futur. Il lui faut donc, ou bien accepter de poursuivre pour une autre année ce qui a marché l'année précédente, ou bien dépendre des projets des autres qui s'accumulent sur son bureau. Il n'a plus, passivement, qu'à refuser ou à accepter de les réaliser, en lorgnant avec une certaine envie, les recherches télévisuelles qui s'effectuent dans les grandes universités, dans les stations de télévision communautaires ou de type "videographe". Dans cet "underground" dégagé des contraintes de la production rentable, on tente des expériences qui peuvent échouer, on ose sortir des sentiers battus et, par là, on découvre.

J'ai ressenti ce malaise et cette insastifaction, cette sensation d'étouffement au terme de plusieurs saisons consécutives, consacrées à des séries d'émissions dramatiques pour enfants. Mais comment se créer un monde d'aventure, de recherche, de découverte, à l'intérieur d'un système qui existe grâce à la plannification et la rentabilité, mais qui, peut-être, ne peut pas survivre sans, l'aventure et la découverte. Triple responsabilité, vis-à-vis du système d'abord, qui combat cet esprit d'aventure, vis-à-vis de nous-mêmes ensuite, pour échapper aux gestes répétés, et vis-à-vis de ceux enfin qui regardent ce que nous faisons afin de leur faire partager une aventure, de les rendre non seulement témoins mais participants.

J'ai cru trouver un début de réponse à cette recherche de l'aventure et de la découverte, dans le monde un peu oublié de la télévision en direct.

Nous savons tous ce qu'elle permet: être témoin du premier pas de l'homme sur la lune, du but gagnant compté par les Canadiens à Moscou, ou du mariage de la Princesse Anne à Londres. Dans cette perspective d'une télévision en direct, il faut que l'événement soit extracrdinaire pour que l'image le devienne à son tour.

J'ai ressenti la certitude que l'image télévisée pouvait aller au-delà de ces limites, lors d'une émission en mondio-vision, émise simultanément en direct d'Australie, d'Europe, d'Amérique du Sud et d'Amérique du Nord. L'image d'un chauffeur d'autobus commençant sa journée à Sydney, au petit jour, n'avait rien d'extraordinaire en soi. Pas plus que celle, mille fois vue et revue sur les écrans de cinéma, du gaucho poussant son troupeau dans une prairie d'Argentine au coucher du soleil. Ce qui en faisait toute l'authenticité, c'est que ces images vivaient véritablement aux mêmes instants, ce qu'aucun autre moyen de communication n'avait pu rendre à ce point tangible auparavant. Ce qui en faisait l'intérêt, c'était donc le lien qu'un réseau d'ondes avait tissé

entre ces hommes. C'est la structure qui faisait ressortir cette présence, une structure de communication encadrant non plus la fiction mais la réalité.

Pour une fois, la télévision n'avait pas enregistré et retransmis un événement extraordinaire en soi. C'est la télévision qui était devenue un événement extraordinaire. C'était en juin 1967. Cette émission avait certainement mobilisé énormément d'énergie et nécessité beaucoup d'argent. Mais, à ma connaissance, depuis cette époque, il n'y a pas eu d'expérience semblable: où sont allés les énergies et les budgets?

La plupart du temps sur des formules classiques de spectacle, on a fait de beaux décors et on a payé de grands artistes.

La télévision permet plus que cela. Non seulement par son instantanéité, mais aussi par la nature même de l'image électronique dont les possibilités sont bien différentes de celles du film.

L'image électronique ne supporte pas la tricherie ou alors elle montre l'homme en train de tricher. Elle démystifie tout et que d'entrevues, même banales, à la télévision, ont tout à coup révélé la vraie personnalité de celui qui était sur la sellette. J'ai souvent cherché à analyser la nature de cette image et ce qui la rendait si crédible.

Est-ce que le balayage électronique épouse mieux la fluidité de la vie que l'instantané de l'image filmée qui l'immobilise arbitrairement 24 fois par seconde? Est-ce que la multiplicité des points de vue — par l'action conjuguée de plusieurs caméras au même moment et en un même lieu ou en des lieux différents — ne plonge pas le téléspectateur au sein d'une réalité comme jamais il ne l'avait été auparavant, alors qu'on ne lui permettait, avec le film, que de partager la vision unique, spécifique, particulière d'un auteur?

Comme je l'ai mentionné plus haut, il s'est trouvé qu'au moment où je me posais toutes ces questions, j'avais parfois l'impression de faire du mauvais cinéma, avec un outil qui n'était pas fait pour ça, avec un outil qui pouvait faire bien autre chose. J'ai donc essayé de rejoindre sa spécificité.

D'abord, je voulais en finir avec le lourd appareillage qui m'avait encombré durant plusieurs années. Ensuite, je voulais sentir la présence de ce public pour lequel on travaille, mais qu'on ne perçoit souvent qu'à travers les chiffres d'une statistique ou d'une cote d'écoute.

Je souhaitais ce public actif pour rompre avec la tradition d'enfants téléspectateurs écrasés devant le téléviseur et à moitié endormis parce que le spectacle auquel ils assistent ne leur offre aucune chance de participation.

L'émission serait donc en direct, avec une communication téléphonique permettant à celui qui serait loin d'agir sur ce qui se passe en studio, en observant sur son écran les résultats de sa demande et de sa participation.

Sur le plateau: trois jeunes, munis de pinceaux et exécutant des dessins suggérés par les téléspectateurs. A partie de cette base, de nombreuses variantes ont été abordées. Parfois les trois jeunes travaillaient sur un seul panneau. Parfois, ils composaient chacun leur tableau. Parfois, ils étaient du même âge, parfois d'âges différents et on avait trois variantes d'une même suggestion. Parfois, ils étaient de milieux sociaux différents. Parfois, nous ne diffusions notre numéro de téléphone que sur une région bien particulière pour que les demandes émanent d'un milieu précis. Telle autre fois, nous avions à l'avance demandé à un peintre professionnel de composer un tableau, divisé en autant de parties qu'il y avait de phrases musicales dans un morceau de musique et, pour chaque partie, il avait donné son interprétation graphique des sons. Les téléspectateurs devaient, à leur tour, en fonction des musiques, suggérer des

formes aux peintres du plateau et, en fin d'émission, on dévoilait le tableau déjà peint. On le confrontait ensuite avec les suggestions venues du dehors. Un tableau sonore avait été créé, que la caméra parcourait selon la musique.

C'est à la fin de cette première saison que l'idée de créer un personnage, un héros — et de créer un anti-héros — est apparue, donnant la primauté cette fois à une histoire qu'inventerait le téléspectateur et qui serait dessinée en studio.

La deuxième saison de "Téléchrome" prenait forme, permettant de rejoindre des objectifs plus précis: invention d'un début d'histoire par un groupe homogène de jeunes qui arrivait en studio avec leur dessin, histoire continuée en direct par les téléspectateurs et dessinée sur leur écran, selon leurs indications et terminée par le même groupe, pour être présentée en entier à l'émission suivante, tandis qu'un nouveau groupe commençait une nouvelle histoire.

Pour la troisième saison, nous voulions donner encore plus d'importance à la bande dessinée, à sa syntaxe, à sa grammaire. Cette fois, les téléspectateurs devaient, chaque début de mois, nous envoyer, sous forme de bande dessinée, un début d'histoire sur un thème que nous choisissions.

Deux critères présidaient au choix des bandes dessinées gagnantes: un critère d'habileté et de professionnalisme et un critère de spontanéité. C'est l'histoire choisie selon le critère de la spontanéité qui était continuée en studio.

La cinquième saison de "Téléchrome" devait orienter la participation vers la création, non plus d'une bande dessinée, mais d'un jeu dramatique. Le téléspectateur dictait à un comédien quel rôle il devait tenir, comment il devait marcher, parler, se comporter... Donc, définition de rôle, création de dialogues entre plusieurs personnages et, par conséquent, de scénario. Malheureusement, les conventions régissant les relations entre Radio-Canada et ses divers collaborateurs, tant artistes que techniciens, ne prévoyant pas ce genre de situation, il ne m'a pas été possible de mettre à exécution ce projet.

Pour faire un bilan, en rapport avec le thème de cette rencontre, je dirais que "Téléchrome" était une tentative pour intégrer une fiction — celle des histoires et des dessins inventés — à une réalité — celle du processus de création lui-même, dans le but de démystifier ce processus, de le rendre accessible. Trop souvent, la création est vue comme venant d'une élite privilégiée et douée, et trop souvent, elle va à sens unique, du créateur au spectateur, sans possibilité pour ce dernier d'intervenir, d'où passivité.

Tout compte fait, en une heure, il y avait environ 18 jeunes différents chaque semaine qui participaient à cette émission, ce qui donnait, sur une saison, une participation active de plus de 700 jeunes, sans compter évidemment les quelque 300 envois hebdomadaires que nous recevions, en moyenne. C'est peu, par rapport à un auditoire de 350,000, mais je pense que rendre un téléspectateur témoin d'un processus de création constitue la meilleure stimulation qui soit. Cette émission, mis à part sa structure, n'existait que par la participation.

Elle était vivante, c'est-à-dire pas toujours en santé: elle avait ses faiblesses, dues à quelques accidents de parcours qui faisaient baisser la participation. Elle rejoignait aussi, indirectement, d'autres objectifs: elle forçait l'enfant qui téléphonait à une plus grande précision dans son langage, pour qu'il puisse être bien compris du dessinateur. Elle essayait de faire le lien, au niveau des bulles sortant de la bouche des personnages, entre la langue parlée et la langue écrite. Elle habituait l'enfant à s'exprimer au moyen de l'image.

Le problème, évidemment, était dans le dosage du spectacle (c'est-à-dire des éléments rythmiques faits pour maintenir l'attention du spectateur) par rapport

à l'improvisation. Nous nous tenions constamment sur une frange instable, en perpétuelle remise en question. Mais nous tenions le téléspectateur au courant de cette recherche. Nous lui annoncions les changements et lui demandions de nous donner son avis par lettre, ce qu'il faisait parfois.

Avant de terminer, je voudrais insister sur l'opportunité de réaliser dans les petits postes émetteurs, des émissions de ce genre, qui n'exigent aucun budget particulier, tout reposant sur la participation et la communication en direct. Je dirais même que ce type d'émission convient mieux à un auditoire restreint qu'à un vaste réseau. C'est un peu comme un jeu que l'on aime jouer entre amis, entre complices. On peut se tromper. On n'est pas là pour faire de la magie. Le micro capte le son, la caméra l'image. Parfois, elle tombe en panne et de trois caméras on passe à deux. On montre au passage, et c'est déjà arrivé, le technicien qui se faufile à la hâte pour ne pas être vu, et qui ouvre le ventre de la machine électronique. On démystifie tout et c'est, paradoxalement, ce qui devient le spectacle.

Je crois que les réalisateurs devraient être plus nombreux à se pencher sur des formules de ce genre, basées sur la communication et l'utilisation de l'outil qu'est la télévision. Qu'ils abandonnent un peu les schémas traditionnels de spectacle, non pas pour éliminer complètement la télévision cinéma chez soi, mais pour permettre, peut-être, en ces périodes d'austérité, d'économiser de l'argent et de mettre plus de budget sur un produit que l'on ne fabriquera pas à la petite semaine.

James Dormeyer
Réalisateur – TV
Emissions Jeunesse